

bulletin



THE UNITED STATES AND THE PROBLEM OF A PEACEFUL
USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY • by Louis L. Brandeis . . . 555

THE U.S. PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE RELIEF • by
Assistant Secretary Morton . . . 561

THE POLITICAL DEMOCRACY AND THE
PROBLEM OF PERSONAL SECURITY • by
William L. White . . . 566

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF WOMEN
OF THE AMERICAS • by Mrs. Catherine M. Lee . . . 574

For the complete bulletin cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXXIII, No. 850 • PUBLICATION 6015

October 10, 1955

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Inter
of A

by
CH

The
words
The A
Preside
United
of the
where i
be free
uses of

Four
Preside
world c
atom, f
ence w
clearer
of this
all of v
ment m
tellectu
peace.

The p
all grev
fisherm
corked
transfo
ening D
call, by
welcom
come ca

This
mushro
ized, is
render a

¹ Addre
and the
on Sept.

October

International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

by *Lewis L. Strauss*

*Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission*¹

The posture of a nation is a composite of the words of its leaders and the deeds of its people. The Atomic Energy Conference had its origin in President Eisenhower's unforgettable words to the United Nations in December of 1953 when he told of the great promise in store for peoples everywhere if the world's scientists and engineers could be free to devote themselves fully to the benign uses of the atom.

Four months later we moved to translate the President's vision into deeds. We proposed a world conference to compare notes on the peaceful atom, for we were convinced that such a conference would give to the peoples of the world a clearer understanding of the paramount problem of this age—a realization of the blessings denied to all of us by reason of the fact that atomic armament must have first call upon the resources, intellectual and material, of a world precariously at peace.

The problem is not a new one. As children, we all grew up with the Arabian Nights story of the fisherman who found a bottle in his nets, uncorked it, and released a great cloud which rapidly transformed itself into the monstrous and threatening Djinn. The story ended happily, as you recall, by the fisherman's artifice in inducing that unwelcome apparition to return to the bottle and become captive once more.

This fable, even to the illustrations of the great mushroom cloud from which the Djinn materialized, is like the situation we face today—how to render atomic energy harmless, how to get it back

into its bottle, under control, so we may make it fulfill our wishes for good purposes only.

The Geneva conference was a step toward that goal, but only a step. The press of the world, which sent some 800 reporters to Geneva, was enthusiastic and generous in its appraisal of the proceedings. They were described as a resounding triumph of "atoms for peace." But this should not conceal for us the fact that the conference was only a preliminary move in a right direction and that succeeding steps will have to be taken if any permanent good is to result.

Participation of 72 Nations

But it was a truly gratifying beginning. The enthusiasm and cooperation which it inspired among the nations, great and small, surpassed the expectations of those whose task it was to set up the conference machinery. They had anticipated that the conference might attract some 400 scientists and that perhaps 300 papers would be submitted. Actually we found that 72 nations were eager to participate and that, not 400 scientists and engineers, but 1,400 would attend. The number of reports and papers submitted was not 300, but nearly four times as many—so many in fact that only a fraction could be presented orally. But most of them, brilliant works, will be published.

The day is not yet here for a precise evaluation of these more than 1,100 papers and discussion sessions. However, enough time has perhaps elapsed for a reminiscent look at the conference, to appraise its more obvious and immediate effects and some of the initial benefits gained from

¹Address made before the Atomic Industrial Forum and the American Nuclear Society at Washington, D.C., on Sept. 28 (Atomic Energy Commission press release).

it. Within those limits I would like to give you my impressions, admittedly from the viewpoint of a prejudiced observer.

First, I might say something about our own participation. Our United States delegation was selected with great care and numbered 384 persons, of whom 239 were scientists and engineers, the remainder being the necessary staff to operate the exhibits, the reactor, and other services.²

Of the 1,110 papers presented to the conference by all the participating countries, either orally or for inclusion in the published proceedings, approximately one-half—to be precise, 48.2 percent—were submitted by the United States. All our papers had been prepared months in advance and carefully reviewed to make certain that no matters of military significance were compromised.

"The Tennessee Chalet"

The nations having atomic energy programs of any magnitude had impressive technical exhibits at the conference, but incontestably the star attraction was our operating research reactor, built at our Oak Ridge Laboratory, flown to Geneva, and erected on the grounds of the Palace of Nations. The attractive redwood structure we put up to house the reactor quickly acquired the nickname of "The Tennessee Chalet," and it was visited by more than 63,000 persons during the 2 weeks of the conference. Incidentally, for most of the delegates from other countries, including scientists and engineers come to deliver learned papers on atomic energy, it was their first opportunity to see an actual atomic reactor of any kind, much less to operate its controls as very many of them did. We also had in our main exhibit an outstanding demonstration of what Americans are doing in pure science, industry, medicine, and biology, and more about power development. Many of you here tonight contributed to this exhibit and are familiar with it. Some of those exhibits, brought from Geneva, are included in the Trade Fair on exhibition here.

At a trade exposition in another section of Geneva, industrial firms of several countries—the Soviets excepted—showed their products to good effect, but we made it clear that we had not come to Geneva to boast of our scientific prowess or, in

other words, that we had not entered with the spirit of carrying off all the laurels in a sort of atomic Olympic Games.

Soviet Exhibit

The Soviet had a large technical exhibit which was chiefly remarkable, from my point of view, for the fact that it was there at all. We have had "atoms for peace" exhibits circulating around the world for more than a year. But, until this conference, we had seen nothing of Russian progress in this field. Therefore, great interest and conjecture attached itself to anything they proposed to show. Because the rest of the world knew so little of what the Russians were doing with the peaceful atom, it was clear that whatever they exhibited, or even reported, would be in the nature of a revelation.

Let me at this point say that they did come up with a great deal. There was no evidence, however—photographic or otherwise—to support the statement made by Soviet official spokesmen a few years back to the effect that, whereas the United States was engrossed with atomic energy to make bombs, they, the Soviets, were using atomic energy to change the courses of rivers and to remove mountains. On the other hand, their exhibits in areas of biology, in certain industrial applications, and in general instrumentation were not unimpressive and occasionally not greatly dissimilar from our own.

However, it was electrical power generation from atomic energy that attracted particular interest in the Soviet exhibit. They demonstrated a scale model of their 5,000-kilowatt reactor and a motion picture of the reactor itself, well photographed and accompanied by a narration in English. They also indicated that larger power reactors of a different design were planned. We, of course, have had units substantially larger than the Soviet plant operating for a considerable time, and far larger ones are building.

Soviet written reports to the conference showed careful preparation and a considerable amount of detail. But it became apparent early in the proceedings that, in answering the questions of delegates, they were not prepared to engage in the same degree of frankness as other delegations.

The Russian delegation, of whom some 79 were technicians, impressed our people as generally competent and, in some instances, as exceptional

² For a list of the U.S. delegation, see BULLETIN of Aug. 8, 1955, p. 243.

men.
their
"They
It is
of our
are w
tions
nology
poses.
we ap
than a
upon i
In t
ever, t
sent
indica
with t
us rea
Wh
not co
some i
the cal
role a
resea

No Jus
The
peacef
by a s
tion f
ation n
Soviet
peacef
this is
Genev
given
to pos
Too
sians,
quite e
spite t
system
the ea
compe
early d
should
dange
never
our gu
Also
condit

men. We have no way of knowing whether it was their first team, but as one of our people said, "They were good enough to be a first team."

It is the general impression among the members of our delegation that, on the basis of Geneva, we are well ahead of other nations—all other nations—in both the scope and the state of our technology in using atomic energy for peaceful purposes. This, however, was to be expected since we appear to have a considerably larger program than any other country and we have been engaged upon it for a longer time.

In this connection it is interesting to note, however, that at least one of the Russian papers presented at the conference bore the date of 1943, indicating that they had been seriously concerned with the subject for a longer time than many of us realize.

While what the Russians revealed at Geneva did not contain anything new or startling, it did give some insight into their working methods and into the caliber of their research. On the basis of their role at Geneva, they appeared stronger in basic research than in its practical applications.

No Justification for Complacency

The fact that we appear to be ahead in the peaceful applications of atomic energy—perhaps by a scant few years—certainly offers no justification for complacency. To the contrary, the situation must be regarded as a serious challenge. The Soviets have not outstripped nor equaled us in any peaceful application, but at the same time—and this is important—we did not show anything at Geneva which they cannot have in a few years, given the talent and zeal which we believe them to possess.

Too many of us have been thinking of the Russians, either by education or temperament, as not quite equal to us in the technological sense. Despite the many things wrong with their political system from our point of view, let us not fall into the easy attitude of assuming that they cannot compete with us in mastering atomic energy. The early date at which they produced nuclear weapons should be a constant reminder of the fallacy and danger of such an attitude on our part. We can never let down our research without letting down our guard at the same moment.

Also, the belief that science cannot thrive under conditions designed solely to protect the security

of data already in hand and deemed important to national defense would seem to be brought into question by the degree of Soviet progress. This progress was achieved under security provisions which are part of a complete tyranny where communication is rigidly controlled and the individual has no rights. Since we proceed under the policy of removing information from classification as rapidly as possible, the Soviet results present something of a paradox.

Power From Atomic Energy

With respect to power from atomic energy, the Geneva conference made it evident that, while others are engaged in extensive undertakings, our program is presently substantially ahead in extent and in the versatility of its approach. As you know, we are relatively close in the United States to the production of economic, electrical energy. Even today, the kilowatts we are producing in our reactors would be economic in some parts of the world.

But different countries are taking different paths to power development, depending upon varying economic factors. England, for example, foresees the end of her increasingly expensive coal. For England, therefore, time is of the essence; she cannot afford to wait for development of the ultimate reactor of maximum efficiency.

Soviet Russia has no private industry interested in developing the peacetime uses of atomic energy and no spirit of competitive free enterprise. In Russia the whole show is a government monopoly. It will be interesting to see how this will affect the search for a more economic and efficient power system than the one they exhibited.

We, in the United States, are fortunate in that we face no urgent shortage of conventional fuels. We have time and the opportunity to attack the problem from every side and to experiment simultaneously with a whole variety of atomic power systems. That is exactly what we are doing. Last week the Commission took another step forward and invited proposals from industry and other groups for the design and construction of small atomic power plants. This marks the second round of a partnership program designed to speed the development of efficient, economic nuclear power. Our first power demonstration reactor program began, as you know, earlier this year and produced proposals for large plants.

American industry is dedicating risk capital in a conservative race to produce the best and most efficient means of atomic power—knowing full well that the first plants will not be economic.

To sum up, we did not go to this conference in an effort to carry away all the honors. If there was some semblance of a contest, in the technical exhibits and in the papers presented, no one lost in this competition. All the nations gained, and the winner was mankind.

New Understanding of U.S. Desire for Peace

From the viewpoint of our national self-interest, however, the conference was certainly a victory for fundamental American policy. We achieved new understanding abroad of our earnest effort to promote a decent and enduring peace.

As a people, knowing full well the sincerity of our own desire for peace, we have not always appreciated how the rest of the world regarded us. Sometimes even nations whose safety from aggression has depended upon our possession of nuclear weapons have shown a tendency to view us with suspicion. Too often, in the past, Communist propaganda has had some success in depicting us as warmongers interested in the atom only to make bombs and ready to use them to gain our supposed imperialist aims. This myth was effectively demolished at Geneva and without our having to brand it as a myth. Our scientists and engineers who went to Geneva and who unfolded there a factual account of our purpose and efforts to use the atom for man's benefit were ambassadors of peace, plenipotentiary and extraordinary.

The conference was convened without any political objective. Nor did it, in its 162 hours of sessions, encounter any political complications. Under its "ground rules" any discussion of political topics or of atomic weapons was out of bounds by common consent, in advance. The fact that no violations of either the letter or the spirit of the conference occurred is one of the principal explanations for its success. But notwithstanding the absence of politics from the conference, it is bound to have a profound international political impact.

Chief Results of Conference

What were its chief results? It would appear that there were several, both immediate and for the not-distant future:

First, the free world—perhaps even the Soviet—has a new understanding of the absolute sincerity of our desire to strip the atom of its "military casing" and "adapt it to the arts of peace." The conference substantially advanced the President's program of "atoms for peace." Any suspicion of our motives, imported to the conference, could not have survived the 2 weeks of Geneva, and many delegates volunteered that statement to me in similar words.

Second, communication was reestablished between men of science who for many years had experienced the isolation of finding those lines down. As a result, much cross-fertilization of ideas will occur and that, inevitably, will stimulate new inventions in many phases of the atomic art during the next year or two.

Third, there can no longer be any talk of nations which, from the point of view of possessing information for the peaceful applications of atomic energy, are "have not" nations. The smaller nations were impressed by the fact that the development of atomic power is a very complex and expensive undertaking—an undertaking which requires, first of all, a grounding in the basic technology and then a substantial body of trained scientists and engineers. The notion that all they have to do is place an order for a reactor out of a catalog and be immediately in business to provide electrical energy from atomic power—if such a notion existed—was, or should have been, dispelled at Geneva.

Fourth, we gained much information of value to ourselves from the conference. One byproduct, I believe, was a rebirth of humility. We learned not to underrate the competence of others and to cease to think of ourselves—those of us, that is, who were so inclined—as especially and exclusively gifted with imagination and ability in exploring the possibilities of the new worlds that lie ahead. This realization could save us in the future from some grievous error of judgment.

Fifth, all of us were impressed by the disturbing fact that Russia appears to be training scientists and engineers at a faster rate than we are. Mr. Allen Dulles, the distinguished Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, has publicly stated that, between 1950 and 1960, Soviet Russia will have graduated 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared with about 900,000 in the United States in our present program. Those figures would not

be so important did we not know that our own colleges and universities are turning out only about half the number of engineers we require today. Unless corrected, this situation, a generation hence, will become a national calamity, imperiling our security and freedom in an age of expanding dependence upon science and technology. This is a most serious subject and demands prompt consideration and more emphasis than I can give it in this general report.

Sixth and finally, in this listing of the results of the world's first Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, I come to the brightest, most appealing of all its accomplishments. As our story of the peaceful atom was printed widely overseas, the result was that for millions of people all over the world Geneva cast off the mesmerism of the bomb. No other event that has occurred has done so much toward taking the horror—the terror—out of the atom.

The first decade of man's mastery of the atom, in its actual application, began on an early morning in July of 1945 in a blinding flash over the sands of Alamogordo. The monstrous Djinn had been released from the bottle. The second decade of the atom may be said to have begun in Geneva, 10 years later, but this time it emerged, not as a terrifying monster, but as the powerful, obedient servant of man. Wider horizons of grander view were opened. To many, it must have seemed that, overnight, the atom had been transformed from a thing of fear and terror to a promise of great blessing.

History may record that in Geneva, at the opening of this second decade of the atom, mankind's stake in peace was lifted out of the paralysis of fear to a vision so compelling as to render unthinkable the very notion of another major war. If the conference produced such a vision, it made a good and auspicious beginning. We must not allow that vision to fade—either for us or for other men.

Foreign Ministers Discuss Coming Geneva Conference

Press release 574 dated September 29

Following is the text of the communique issued at New York on September 28 at the conclusion of the meeting held there September 27 and

28 by the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America met in New York on September 27 and September 28 to continue preparations for the forthcoming Geneva Conference.

In reviewing progress already made in this respect, they found themselves in complete accord. In particular they agreed that priority should be given to the reunification of Germany, within the framework of a plan for European security.

They also made provisions for further consultation with their NATO partners, and expect to meet in Paris with the other members of the North Atlantic Council prior to the Geneva Conference.

On September 28, they were joined by the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany and continued their discussion of matters of common concern.

The three Foreign Ministers also met with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and had a useful discussion of the arrangements for the Geneva Conference.

U.S.-U.K.-French Views on Germany

Press release 573 dated September 29

The following statement was issued at New York on September 28 by the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France.

The Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France wish to make known their view on certain points in connection with the agreements of September 20, 1955, as reported in the press, between the Soviet Union and the regime in the Soviet zone of Germany.

They wish in the first place to emphasize that these agreements cannot affect the obligations or responsibilities of the Soviet Union under agreements and arrangements between the Three Powers and the Soviet Union on the subject of Germany and Berlin. The Soviet Union remains responsible for the carrying out of these obligations.

Secondly, the three Foreign Ministers reaffirm that the Federal Republic of Germany is the only German Government freely and legitimately constituted and therefore entitled to speak for Germany as the representative of the German people

in international affairs. These three governments do not recognize the East German regime nor the existence of a state in the Soviet zone.

Finally, as regards a statement which has recently appeared in the Soviet press on the frontiers of Germany, the three Foreign Ministers reaffirm the repeatedly expressed position of their Governments that the final determination of the frontiers of Germany must await a peace settlement for the whole of Germany.

Policy on Supplying Arms to Countries of Middle East

Joint U.S.-British Statement¹

The United States Secretary of State and British Foreign Secretary discussed together reports relating to their arms supply policies in the Middle East.

They wish to state that the United States and British Governments have for some time been in close consultation with each other as well as with other governments in relation to this matter and that there has been, and continues to be, complete harmony of views between their two governments.

Both governments base their policies on the desire, on the one hand, to enable the various countries to provide for internal security and for their defense, and on the other, to avoid an arms race which would inevitably increase the tensions in the area. They will continue, and hope other governments will continue, to be guided by these principles.

Talks Between Secretary Dulles and German Foreign Minister

Press release 579 dated September 30

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. von Brentano, with his advisers, met on September 30 with the Secretary of State and officials of the State and Defense Departments. After first meeting at the Department of State, they continued their talks during luncheon at Blair House.

¹ Issued at New York City on Sept. 27 by Secretary Dulles and Foreign Secretary Harold Macmillan.

The conversation was informal and of a general nature, since there had already been a full exchange of views on matters of common concern when Dr. von Brentano and Secretary Dulles recently met in New York with the Foreign Ministers of the United Kingdom and France.

Among subjects covered here was the situation of Berlin in the light of recent developments. They also touched on the matter of European integration. The Secretary indicated the importance which the United States attaches to this development.

The meeting served to underline the close and friendly relations between the Federal Republic and the United States.

U.S. Friendship for Greece

Following is the text of a letter from President Eisenhower to King Paul of Greece, delivered in Athens on September 29.

In the present difficult situation, I desire to assure Your Majesty that I remain deeply convinced of the paramount importance of the ties of strong friendship which unite Greece and the United States. Even if there are differences of opinion over how the Cyprus question should be handled, we shall not let this one issue trouble our deep friendship and sympathy for Greece.

With kindest personal assurances,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Recognition of New Government of Argentina

White House Office (Denver) press release dated September 25

The Ambassador of the United States of America at Buenos Aires, Albert F. Nufer, informed the Argentine Foreign Office at 9 a. m., e. s. t. (11 a. m., Argentine time) on September 25 that the Government of the United States recognizes the new government headed by Maj. Gen. Eduardo Lonardi as the Government of the Republic of Argentina.

In taking this action, the United States Government looks forward to the continuance of the friendly relations which have existed between the United States and Argentina.

The U.S. Program for Refugee Relief

by *Thruston B. Morton*

*Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations*¹

United States citizenship is a proud and honorable claim. Those of us who hold it through an accident of birth do not always appreciate just how much it means. Only through meeting and talking to those who have sweated and struggled to win American citizenship can we gain a full appreciation of what this privilege means to those less fortunate than ourselves.

We natives sometimes lose sight of the strength and protection offered by our Constitution and by our historic Bill of Rights—which, incidentally, was proposed to the Congress just 166 years ago today. To thousands of new Americans who have for a decade or more lived in the shadow of fear and oppression and the secret police, however, this great document and its amendments truly offer a new lease on life and new hope.

All of you are familiar with the famous words of Emma Lazarus:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

These words are as vital today as they were when they were written. The lamp is still burning brightly; the golden door has not been shut.

All of us here are descendants, no matter how far removed, of immigrants. Our forebears saw in America a land of promise. They came here seeking fulfillment of that promise.

Today more men, women, and children are coming to our shores. These new immigrants and future citizens will one day stand as equals before the law with descendants of the Mayflower's pas-

sengers. The Constitution, as Wendell Willkie aptly phrased it, does not provide for first- and second-class citizens.

Much of America's strength has been drawn from the energy and imagination of our new citizens. In Israel Zangwill's words, "America is God's Crucible, the great Melting-Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming. . . ." Each group of new Americans brings to this country a new wealth of spirit, a new store of promise and of hope. "Homeless, tempest-tossed," they are the same material upon which this nation of ours was built.

Many who come to our shores today are refugees who have risked life itself to escape from totalitarian oppression. These people have a spirit which refuses to submit to chains. And they had the will and strength to break out of the chains that bound them.

In many parts of the world men are still in chains. This is particularly true of the eastern part of Germany and the formerly independent nations of Eastern Europe and the Baltic area.

U.S. Position at Geneva

Since the "summit" conference at Geneva there has been some feeling that what is called the "spirit of Geneva" will cause us to forget the captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

Let me assure you that this will not happen.

We went to Geneva because of the American people's belief in peace. At Geneva we fully supported the principles upon which Americans believe an enduring peace must be based. There was no compromise with these principles as a result of the conference.

A cardinal principle among these beliefs is the right of every nation to independence and a free

¹ Address made at the Citizenship Day Festival of the Americanization League of America at Milwaukee, Wis., on Sept. 25 (press release 564 dated Sept. 23).

choice of its institutions. This concept lies at the very foundation of American political traditions. No administration in this country could ever fail to make it a basic principle in American foreign policy.

Americans naturally believe this principle applies to Eastern and Central Europe, where kinship and common culture strengthen their ties with the people. Woodrow Wilson's well-known advocacy of self-determination for the peoples of this area was one of the clearest expressions of that unchanging desire of Americans to see the Eastern European nations enjoy freedom and independence. More recently, President Eisenhower's memorable address of April 16, 1953,² reemphasized this principle.

The United States remained faithful to this principle at Geneva. The question of self-government in Eastern Europe was raised as a fundamental issue by President Eisenhower³ when he said:

On a broader plane, there is the problem of respecting the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and of restoring sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of them. The American people feel strongly that certain peoples of Eastern Europe, many with a long and proud record of national existence, have not yet been given the benefit of this pledge of our United Nations wartime declaration, reinforced by other wartime agreements.

That is the unswerving position of the United States in this matter. President Eisenhower made clear the attitude of the American people on the need to restore sovereign rights and self-government to the peoples of Eastern Europe.

We sought at the Geneva conference to lay a better basis for peace. And, at the same time, we sought to work in a positive and practicable way through diplomatic means toward steps which would assist the eventual winning of freedom by the captive peoples.

One definite goal was to bring about an improved international situation based on cooperation that might induce the Soviet Union to recognize that there can and must be freedom for the Central and Eastern European peoples without jeopardy to its own security. Freedom for these nations is indeed an essential component of security for all European nations.

² BULLETIN of Apr. 27, 1953, p. 599.

³ *Ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1955, p. 172.

The American people welcome, as a step in the right direction, the changed attitude of the Soviet leaders and the apparent agreement at Geneva that the Soviet Union and the West will in the future attempt to resolve the issues between them through peaceful negotiations in a more favorable international atmosphere.

We must have deeds in addition to words, however. For the American people, Geneva will remain a gesture without substance unless it leads to concrete actions on the part of the present Communist governments in the form of benefits to the captive peoples, an alleviation of their burdens, and the restoration of their freedom.

In the meantime we will continue to work constructively for the creation of a secure peace. We continue to believe that the question of the status of the captive peoples must be settled satisfactorily in obtaining a secure peace. We are determined to do all we can to find positive means to open the door to the emancipation of these people. We are certain that this purpose expresses the unalterable conviction of the American people.

But while the present situation exists in the satellite countries, the flow of refugees continues. And as long as these refugees pour out from behind the Iron Curtain, we have a moral responsibility to do what we can to help them readjust and resettle in the free world.

Administration of Refugee Relief Program

One of the principal ways in which we are doing this is through the Refugee Relief Program. All of you here, I am sure, are familiar to some extent with this program. Some of you may actually have come to this country under the program's auspices. If any of you have, may I add my own expression of welcome to our country and the hope that your life here will compensate for the unpleasant experiences of the past.

The Refugee Relief Act was put into effect on August 7, 1953.⁴ Under the terms of the act a maximum of 214,000 victims of war's aftermath, natural disaster, oppression, persecution, and adverse economic conditions in their native lands may become permanent residents of the United States and eventually American citizens.

This program came about because of President Eisenhower's deep concern over the increasing

⁴ For articles on the Refugee Relief Act, see *ibid.*, Aug. 24, 1953, p. 231, and Sept. 27, 1954, p. 452.

numbers of refugees, particularly those coming from behind the Iron Curtain. When he recommended the emergency legislation known as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953,⁵ he said:

These refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. International political considerations are also factors which are involved. We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of the free world.

Both Houses of Congress took action in translating the President's request into legislation and agreed on a compromise figure of 214,000 people to be admissible under the act.

Let me clear up one minor point of confusion at this juncture. A figure of 209,000 is often used in connection with this program rather than the total of 214,000. That lower figure is the total number of visas permissible under the act, because 5,000 of the overall total are nonimmigrants already in the United States.

The various Governmental units which work together in administering this act are the State Department's refugee relief administration; the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department; Labor's Bureau of Employment Security and the U.S. Employment Service; the U.S. Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the Army's Counterintelligence Corps; and the Treasury Department.

In addition help is provided by the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration (ICEM), 30 voluntary agencies, and 37 Governor's Committees throughout the United States.

The ICEM is composed of 26 members, of which the United States is one. We contribute slightly more than one-third of the Committee's operating budget and work very closely with it in helping people get not only to this country but to other places in the Western Hemisphere.

The voluntary agencies, which include such groups as the Lutheran Refugee Service, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Church World Service, and the United HIAS Service, have been of great value in helping to arrange travel and transportation in cooperation with ICEM.

The Governor's Committees came about as a

result of a personal plea from President Eisenhower on August 7, 1954.⁶ He called the Governors' attention to the urgent need to stimulate the flow of assurances through the establishment of local refugee committees. New York at that time had already set up such a committee, and 36 other States have since followed its lead. There is still time for the remaining States to take action, however, and such a move would be more than welcomed by those most concerned with the program. The more interest and participation that can be obtained at the grass roots, the greater the chances will be for a completely successful program.

The Refugee Relief Act is an extremely intricate and complicated piece of legislation. It requires a complex organizational setup to administer its technical requirements. That organization is now established and fully operative, and it is working out quite well. The present staff can easily meet the current workload and more, and reserves are available to handle any increase in volume.

Changes in the program's administration and amendments made to the regulations in order to speed up the steps necessary to process a refugee have greatly simplified the situation that existed in the program's early stages. Practices and procedures are being scanned constantly to assure maximum efficiency and simplicity of operations.

The two things most necessary now to further expedite the fulfillment of the aims of the act are an increased flow of assurances and congressional approval of the amendments to the act proposed by President Eisenhower.

More Assurances Needed

The act provides that a refugee must have an assurance of a job, housing, and against becoming a public charge. This assurance must be signed by a U.S. citizen and verified by the Administrator.

In the early days of the program many of the assurances went for overseas relatives known to the assurer. Today the relative category has been pretty well used up and we need assurers who will sign for people they don't know. This is, of course, a much more difficult job.

This is where the voluntary agencies and the Governor's Committees are needed the most. And it is where such groups as yours can be of great

⁵ *Ibid.*, May 4, 1953, p. 639.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Aug. 16, 1954, p. 239.

assistance in spreading the word of the urgent need for assurances.

Perhaps some facts and figures on where we stand now will help explain the need for assurances.

Visa issuance in the Refugee Relief Program, I am happy to report, has now exceeded the 50,000 mark.

Total of visas issued by September 16 was 52,068. This is an increase of 35,018 visas since last January 1—and the increase each week now is near 1,500 visas.

There is another impressive gain in the number of cases entering the program's so-called "pipeline." This figure is the cumulative total of all persons who have been notified of documents required to process their cases. The total of all applicants is now 169,229, a gain of 106,376 since January 1.

It is of interest to note that from the beginning of the program in August 1953 until December 31, 1954—a period of nearly 17 months—17,053 visas were issued. On the other hand, between January 1 of this year and September 16—a period of not quite 9 months—35,018 visas were issued, more than twice the total on record the first of this year. This graphically demonstrates the extent of the increase in the rate of visa issuances in 1955.

During the same period of 1955, however, verified assurances from U.S. citizen sponsors were only 73 percent greater than the number of verified assurances received during the preceding 17 months.

I think those figures point up the seriousness of the lack of assurances. This situation cannot be overemphasized. We are reaching the stage of the program where time has become critical.

As many of you may know, the State Department recently held a conference of chairmen of Governor's Committees at Washington at which the whole emphasis was on the procurement of assurances. Secretary Dulles told this conference:

We are facing a situation now where the bottleneck is . . . the problem of getting assurances The visas are being issued at a rate which is going to catch up with our present backlog and then the question is getting these assurances.

I know Wisconsin ranks tenth in the Nation in procuring assurances for refugees, however, and it is a very fine record. But, to repeat myself, time is running short and an increased flow of assur-

ances must be stimulated if we are to make the deadline of December 31, 1956.

Pierce J. Gerety, the program's Deputy Administrator, emphasized this point when he told the delegation at the conference:

The next 6 or 8 months are very critical in the role you people can play, which is producing assurances back home. We have to get the assurances in sufficient number back home in order to give us time to process the applications and issue the visas so people can come to the United States.

The three major areas where assurances are most needed are Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands. When we ask for assurances, we are addressing ourselves primarily to these areas because we have enough assurances in Greece and Italy, the two other major refugee centers.

Under the act 90,000 expellees and escapees are admissible from Germany and Austria, and 17,000 refugees and relatives are admissible from the Netherlands. To date we have only 437 verified assurances in the Netherlands, only 14,079 in Germany, and only 5,494 in Austria. That is what makes these three areas more critical than any other spots in the program.

Up until a short time ago, some social welfare agencies, upon whom great reliance must be placed for the procurement of assurances, argued that assurances were slow in forthcoming because of the small number of people who had entered the country under the terms of the act. While this may have been true in the act's early days, it is no longer valid today. Steps leading to the issuance of a visa have been simplified greatly and the major concern now is getting enough assurances.

Amendments Recommended by President

In an effort to expedite the flow of assurances and make it possible for the program to fulfill its aims, President Eisenhower on May 27 of this year asked for 10 specific amendments to the act.⁷ He pointed out that the purposes of the act are not being achieved as swiftly as we had all hoped. Although administrative improvements have been made, the President noted, such improvements by themselves are not enough. For that reason Mr. Eisenhower recommended amendments which embraced these changes:

1. A redefinition of the terms "refugee," "escapee," and "expellee," the effect of which will be

⁷ *Ibid.*, June 13, 1955, p. 951.

to relax somewhat the restrictions contained in the definitions of those terms in the act, removal of the limitation that all those who are found to be "firmly resettled" are ineligible for visas, and abandonment of the requirement that a "refugee" must be "out of his usual place or abode" in order to qualify.

2. Adoption of a provision enabling members of a family who are separated from the principal applicant and who cannot accompany the principal applicant at the time the visa is issued to follow to join him in the United States.

3. Adoption of a provision to permit an alien afflicted with tuberculosis to come to the United States with his family if all are eligible, notwithstanding the bar of the immigration laws against a person so afflicted.

4. The reallocation of visas unused during the life of the act to the use of orphans on a worldwide basis and the raising of the maximum-age limitations for eligible orphans from 10 years to 12 years.

5. Definition of the term "eligible orphan" and the imposition of certain limitations upon the adoption abroad of an orphan by a U.S. citizen and spouse.

6. Revision of the criteria for adjustment of status of aliens in the United States to eliminate the requirement that they must have entered this country in lawful status as nonimmigrants in all cases.

7. Adoption of a provision to permit voluntary agencies, as well as individual citizens, to file assurances of employment, housing, and against becoming a public charge.

8. Elimination of the requirement that a valid passport or similar document be produced in each case as a prerequisite to the issuance of a visa.

9. Adoption of a provision to place exclusive responsibility upon the consular officer for the determination of eligibility of an applicant.

10. Elimination of the requirement that a 2-year history covering the period prior to application for visa must be available.

Of these 10 amendments suggested by the President, we feel that two are of primary importance and are needed most urgently.

First is the so-called agency assurance, which is in effect now by regulation but which would be much simpler for everybody if it were in the act.

This situation has been helped by the Administrator's instruction to consular officers of February 18, 1955, which permits the "preprocessing" of cases. Preprocessing, in simple terms, means that a case may be processed before the receipt of an assurance if the sponsoring agency states that an assurance to cover the case will be received. The obvious advantage of this procedure is that individual cases may be processed and made ready for completion upon the arrival of an assurance.

The second important amendment is the redefinition of the term "refugee." We are working with definitions first put forward in 1948, and the many changes which have taken place in refugee conditions throughout the world making a redefinition necessary are readily apparent.

None of these amendments was adopted in the first session of the 84th Congress. Not only would they be of tremendous benefit in aiding the Refugee Relief Program, but they would contribute toward the correction of deficiencies in our immigration and naturalization policies.

The proposed amendments are relatively simple and offer an immediate correction of some of the existing deficiencies. The liberalization of immigration requirements which the amendments provide would facilitate the admission of many deserving persons to this country. This would clearly and promptly indicate to the peoples of friendly nations the intent of the President and the Congress in this subject.

Secretary Dulles has strongly urged the adoption of these amendments in the early days of the coming session of the Congress. Favorable action on these amendments will be highly beneficial to our relations with friendly countries. Passage of the amendments, I am confident, will also bring forth the necessary assurances in greater numbers than ever before both from voluntary agencies and from individual citizens.

At this time of year, when we commemorate Citizenship Day, it is appropriate that Americans everywhere take note of these matters concerning possible future citizens. If we in America live up to our finest humanitarian tradition and act with wisdom, many unfortunate people who today live in refugee camps watching for a glimmer from liberty's torch may in future years celebrate this occasion with us.

U.S.-Yugoslav Talks Concluded

Following is the text of a joint communiqué released at Belgrade on October 1.

The visit of Deputy Under Secretary Robert Murphy to Belgrade has provided opportunity for frank and fruitful discussion of a wide range of problems of mutual interest to Yugoslavia and the United States. As a result, differences of opinion have been ironed out and a clearer understanding of objectives reached. This has been achieved in a very cordial atmosphere and should establish a solid basis for the further cooperation of the two countries. These meetings gave further evidence of the confidence and mutual respect which has been established between the two countries in recent years.

During his visit Mr. Murphy, accompanied by Ambassador [James W.] Riddleberger, had luncheon and two conversations with President Tito and several meetings with Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Prica, Vice President Vukmanovic-Tempo, and Defense Minister Gosnjak. Mr. Murphy concluded his conversations with a luncheon on October 1 tendered at the American Embassy in honor of Vice President Kardelj and other high-ranking Yugoslav and American officials.

Illness of President Eisenhower

Press release 575 dated September 29

In response to questions from the press, Secretary Dulles made the following informal statement just prior to departing for Ottawa, Canada, September 25, 1955, to attend the meetings of the Joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.

President Eisenhower's illness is a cause for sadness, which is felt throughout the nation and throughout the world. But it is not a cause for alarm.

I have no knowledge of a medical character which is not known to everyone. But this information, that we all have, seems to indicate that the attack is similar to that which many people incur without any permanent ill effects. That is what all the world hopes.

In the meantime, our governmental processes, both foreign and domestic, are going to go forward in an orderly and uninterrupted manner.

President Eisenhower has been one of the greatest advocates of a government of principles and not a government of personalities. He has constantly striven to hammer out governmental policies through Cabinet and National Security Council discussions and decisions. These have been shared by the Vice President, by the Cabinet members, and by heads of governmental agencies. Thus President Eisenhower has forged a team, and the principles and policies under which that team operates are well known to all of its members.

Thus, there can be ample time for the President to make a full recovery without any jeopardy to the welfare of the Nation or to the steady prosecution of our national and international policies for peace and human welfare.

I have been asked whether I shall go ahead with plans for meeting with the other three Foreign Ministers at Geneva the end of next month. The answer is that, of course, I expect to be there. Our national bipartisan attitude toward these matters is well known, and nothing which in any event we intended to improvise.

Mr. Hoover and Mr. Hollister Leave for Far East

Departure Statement by the Under Secretary

Press release 572 dated September 29

Mr. Hollister and I are making a visit to the Far East to study at first hand the problems of that area. I will leave Manila for Washington on October 14. Mr. Hollister will go on to be head of our delegation to the Colombo Plan conference at Singapore and will visit some other countries in that area on his way home.

By this personal visit we hope to add to our understanding of the many countries through which we will travel. We are looking forward to the opportunity to talk with leaders and officials of these countries. Through friendly discussions we hope to arrive at a deeper knowledge of how best to proceed with our common effort. Of course we will also visit our own diplomatic and operations missions.

The Colombo Plan conference to which Mr. Hollister will be our chief delegate is of considerable importance. As you know, the Colombo Plan is concerned with economic development as a means

of providing greater opportunity for the peoples of Southeast Asia.

I am pleased that Mr. Herbert V. Prochnow is also accompanying us. Mr. Prochnow was sworn in today as a special consultant and it is Secretary Dulles' intention to recommend to the President that Mr. Prochnow be appointed Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.¹

Announcement Concerning Itinerary

Press release 580 dated September 30

The Department of State announced on September 29 that Under Secretary Hoover would return to Washington October 17 from his current trip to the Far East to enable him to have a few days in Washington before the Secretary of State departs for Geneva. Herbert V. Prochnow, Consultant to the Secretary of State, will return with Mr. Hoover.²

At the same time it was announced that John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, would serve as U.S. Representative at the Ministerial Meeting of the Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia which is to be held at Singapore from October 17 to October 22, 1955.

The revised itinerary follows:³

September 29 leave Washington
September 30 arrive Hickham Field, Honolulu
October 1 leave Hickham Field, Honolulu
October 3 arrive Tokyo
October 5 leave Tokyo
October 5 arrive Seoul
October 8 leave Seoul
October 8 arrive Taipei
October 11 leave Taipei
October 11 arrive Manila

¹ The President signed Mr. Prochnow's commission as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs on Oct. 4.

² It was subsequently decided that Mr. Prochnow will make the balance of the trip with Mr. Hollister and will attend the Colombo Plan meeting at Singapore as adviser to the U.S. delegation.

³ For the original itinerary, see press release 549 dated Sept. 16 (not printed here).

Mr. Hoover will leave Manila October 14 and arrive in Washington on October 17.

Mr. Hollister and his associates will leave Manila on October 15. The balance of their itinerary follows:

October 15 arrive Djakarta
October 16 leave Djakarta
October 16 arrive Singapore
October 21 leave Singapore
October 21 arrive Bangkok
October 24 leave Bangkok
October 24 arrive Vientiane
October 24 leave Vientiane
October 24 arrive Phnom Penh
October 25 leave Phnom Penh
October 25 arrive Saigon
October 27 leave Saigon
October 30 arrive Washington

Change in U.S. Delegation to Colombo Plan Meeting

Press release 576 dated September 30

On September 16 the Department released the names of the U.S. delegation to the Seventh Meeting of the Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (commonly known as the Colombo Plan), which is to be held at Singapore from September 29 to October 22, 1955.⁴ At that time it was announced that Acting Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Thorsten V. Kalijarvi would serve as U.S. Representative to the Ministerial Meeting which is to be held from October 17 to 22.

The Department announced on September 29 that John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State, would serve as U.S. Representative at the Ministerial Meeting. With the revision of Mr. Hollister's itinerary of his current Far Eastern trip permitting him to attend the Colombo Plan meeting, it was felt essential that Mr. Kalijarvi remain in Washington.

⁴ BULLETIN of Sept. 26, 1955, p. 513.

American Political Democracy and the Problem of Personnel Security

by R. W. Scott McLeod

*Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs*¹

You will note that I have altered the subject originally assigned for discussion by exchanging the words "Personnel Security" for the words "National Security." This seems to me a more accurate statement of the matter within my competence. I do not believe that American political democracy needs a new endorsement. I believe we are all devoted to it as the best human system of government yet devised. Over a period of 175 years of tremendous changes in society we have found it to be flexible enough to endure. And it is exactly because we so cherish it that some of us have been given special duties to protect it.

As you know, there are three kinds of security as we practice it in government today. There is physical security, by which we mean the protection which is afforded to documents. It embraces the systems of codes and ciphers, the storage, the transmission, and the handling of papers on which the Government has recorded information which, if in unfriendly hands, might have an adverse effect on the national interest. There is also technical security, a vast field in this technological age, wherein we attempt to protect primarily against devices intended to obtain classified information when it is spoken in conversations presumed to be private.

Obviously the elaborate and sometimes costly apparatus to lock the barn before the horse is stolen is useless if the man who possesses the key to the barn is not trustworthy. Thus, today I will confine my discussion to the program which seeks to assure personnel of integrity.

There have been security programs in our Government before those which are aimed at protecting against the Communist conspiracy. During

the time I lived in New Hampshire I was told that a loyalty oath was required of citizens of that area during the period which preceded the Revolutionary War. Although a loyalty oath is a useless device unless it is predicated on a purpose to prosecute perjurers, I assume that this early requirement in one of the colonies resulted from a preoccupation with the matter of personnel security.

At one time or another in our history Tories, Indians, and Southern sympathizers were security risks, and it seems a logical assumption that some means were used to keep such individuals out of the councils of government.

The earliest attention to the problem under discussion today appears to have been the hearings conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1938 which disclosed the connections of some Federal employees with Communist front organizations.

No doubt as the result of these hearings and because of the war clouds gathering in Europe, the Congress in 1939 adopted section 9A of the Hatch Act, which forbade an employee of the Government to belong to any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government.²

² 5 U. S. C. 118j. Federal employees; membership in political parties; penalties. (1) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation, or any part thereof, is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any Act of Congress, to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States. (2) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any Act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such persons.

¹ Address made before the American Political Science Association at Boulder, Colo., on Sept. 9.

Beginning in 1941 the Congress established a practice which has since become standard, of inserting language in appropriation bills making it unlawful to use the funds to pay the salary of persons who advocate, or belong to organizations which advocate, overthrow of the Government by force and violence and making it a felony for such persons to accept such salary.

And during the war years—in fact, up until 1950—the military agencies were given broad security authority.³

There were other gestures in the direction of security, evidencing a rather vague awareness that a problem, not too clearly stated, existed and should be dealt with.⁴

During the war, of course, the public mind was largely concerned with the Nazi-Fascist menace. After the war a series of incidents made it rather apparent that our wartime ally and the international conspiracy it fostered was a continuing menace to our national security. This was a bitter disillusionment to those who looked forward so eagerly to peace.

The *Amerasia* case, the report of the Canadian Royal Commission, and the reports by Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers gave responsible officials pause, and such of these matters as reached public notice contributed to the necessity to take effective measures for control.

Congressional reaction was expressed in July 1946 by the enactment of the so-called McCarran Rider⁵ to the State Department Appropriation

³ In general, they were authorized to dismiss civilian employees whenever such dismissal was "warranted by the demands of national security" (P. L. 703 and 671, 76th Cong., and P. L. 808, 77th Cong.).

⁴ On Sept. 26, 1942, the Civil Service Commission revised its regulations to provide for dismissal of civil employees on grounds of "reasonable doubt as to loyalty" (Section 18 2(c) (7) (c)). Authority for this action was based on the Lloyd-LaFollette Act of 1912 (5 U. S. C. 652). Also, in April 1942 the Attorney General set up an inter-departmental advisory committee to advise agencies on how to handle complaints from the Dies committee and to develop uniform procedures for the use of Federal Bureau of Investigation reports. And on Feb. 5, 1943, Executive Order 9300 (8 *Fed. Reg.* 1701) established a President's Inter-Departmental Committee to perform similar functions.

⁵ "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States

Bill. This proviso gave the Secretary of State the right "in his absolute discretion" to dismiss employees when deemed "necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

Evolution of Present Personnel Security Order

It seems clear that the present-day effort to obtain integrity in the Federal work force is the result of the success of the Communist conspirators in penetrating and contaminating that force. The postwar revelations that Communist agents actually worked in the Government were shocking to most Americans. Citizens had become accustomed to affording a considerable respect to the officials of their Government. The demonstration that some of these officials were unworthy brought disillusionment and demands that measures be taken to cope with this matter.

On November 25, 1946, as a result of recommendations from the Congress, President Truman issued Executive Order 9806⁶ establishing a temporary commission on employee loyalty. The commission was directed to study existing security measures. As a result of the commission's work, Executive Order 9835⁷ was issued on March 21, 1947.

Executive Order 9835 provided an entirely new approach to the problem. For the first time the Federal Government proposed to look at each of its 2.5 million employees with the purpose of examining the loyalty of each.

The procedures devised for this break with the past are of interest. The name of each employee, together with his fingerprints, was furnished to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a name check. If "derogatory information" was found in the FBI records, a full field investigation was to be made. The results were furnished the employing agency. The standard for dismissal under Executive Order 9835 was "reasonable grounds for belief" that the employee was "disloyal to the Government of the United States."

As a result of experience with this order it was amended on April 28, 1951,⁸ so that the standard

whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States." The rider was contained in each appropriation bill up to and including that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

⁶ 11 *Fed. Reg.* 13863.

⁷ 12 *Fed. Reg.* 1935.

⁸ Executive Order 10241, 16 *Fed. Reg.* 3690.

was "reasonable doubt as to the loyalty" of the employee to the Government.

The element of security as apart from loyalty entered the picture as a general program on August 27, 1950,⁹ when the 81st Congress enacted Public Law 733, the legal basis for the existing program. This law provided for the suspension of employees in 11 named agencies, including the Department of State, and the termination of such employees in the interests of national security, if certain procedural safeguards as set forth in the statute were afforded the employee.

The evolution of a security as distinguished from a loyalty program is an important consideration and represents again the fact that the responsible authorities were directing their efforts against the Communist conspiracy. In dealing with the problem as a practical matter it became apparent that an employee who is loyal to our Government can pose a threat to the national interest.

This is a point which is still obscure in the public mind. It has had an important bearing on the public relations aspect of the problem, for, while employees dismissed between the period of 1947 to 1950 were dismissed generally under a loyalty standard (since only a few agencies had security authority), those handled between 1950-1953 in agencies covered by Public Law 733 could either be disloyal or be security risks.

The Eisenhower security program, brought into being by Executive Order 10450 on April 27, 1953, is clearly a security program, with the issue of loyalty only one of the standards.¹⁰

Security Programs in the State Department

The State Department, together with the military and intelligence services, must always expect to be a primary target of an international conspiracy. There is ample evidence that the Department has long been conscious of its position. Prior to enactment of the McCarran Rider on July

⁹ A few civilian agencies and the military departments previously had special security authority. The State Department began security determinations after the McCarran Rider was enacted in 1946 and after Executive Order 9835 in 1947 continued to make security determinations collaterally with loyalty findings.

¹⁰ Executive Order 10450 (18 *Fed. Reg.* 2489) extended P. L. 733 in accordance with section 3 of that law to all departments and agencies, an extension upheld on July 28, 1955, by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the case of *Cole v. Young*.

5, 1946, there was a Personnel Security Committee in the Department, but its authority was limited to that provided by the Hatch Act and the Civil Service Regulations.

After the McCarran Rider became effective, the Department of State established the Advisory Committee on Personnel Security, which operated until July 1947, when the Personnel Security Board was established. Regulations were adopted by the Board to consider security cases under the authority of the McCarran Rider. In December 1947 the Board was directed to consider cases arising under the loyalty program initiated by Executive Order 9835. In June 1948 the Board was redesignated as the Loyalty Security Board and detailed regulations were adopted to provide for the processing of both loyalty and security cases. The Department derived its loyalty authority from Executive Order 9835 and its security authority from the McCarran Rider. The enactment of Public Law 733 in August 1950 provided additional security authority. The Loyalty Security Board continued until May 27, 1953, when Executive Order 10450, issued 30 days earlier, became effective and required new procedures.

Premises of Existing Security Program

As Administrator of the State Department's security program there are certain premises on which the program is based of which I must be cognizant.

1. There exists a clear and present danger to our society. This danger is caused by the existence of a criminal conspiracy called communism, which aims to overthrow our Government and change our society by whatever means it may find available, including force, violence, and subversion.

If this danger did not exist it would be difficult to justify any security program, or at least one as thorough as that which we have. That it does exist has been established by law, by Executive order, and by judicial interpretation. Congressional mandates and Executive orders to combat this danger have been cited previously.¹¹

¹¹ The most recent re-statement of this doctrine by the Congress was the enactment of the Communist Control Act of 1954 (Section 841, Title 50, U.S.C.A.) wherein Congress stated, "holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile power renders its existence a clear, present and continuing danger to the security of the United States."

The courts have upheld this finding. In sentencing the Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act in 1949,¹² Judge Medina stated,

These defendants were not convicted merely for their political beliefs or ideas or for belonging to the Communist Party. I made it plain in my charge the jury could not convict for anything like that but they had to find there was specific intent to overthrow the Government by force and violence and to use words as a rule of action. . . .

2. That Federal employment is a privilege. This premise is stated in the two "whereas" clauses on which the President predicated Executive Order 10450.

3. That maximum protection must be afforded the employee of the Government against unfounded accusations, rumor, gossip, and unreliable information. This premise is also stated in the "whereas" clause of Executive Order 10450. The two clauses embracing these two premises are as follows:

WHEREAS the interests of the national security require that all persons *privileged to be employed* in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character, and of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States; and

WHEREAS the American tradition that all persons should receive fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government requires that all persons seeking the *privilege of employment or privileged to be employed* in the departments and agencies of the Government be adjudged by mutually consistent and no less than minimum standards and procedures among the departments and agencies governing the employment and retention in employment of persons in the Federal Service. (emphasis supplied)

In recognition of these premises the State Department issued regulations which, when they were published on July 27, 1953, had the effect of law. Our regulations were modeled in the Department of Justice. They have been tested by two years of use. Moreover, under the terms of Executive Order 10450 the Civil Service Commission makes a "continuing study" of the implementation of the order and reports "deficiencies" and "tendencies" to the head of the department and the National Security Council.¹³

¹²Smith Act, Section 2385, Title 18, U. S. Code. The conviction was upheld by the Supreme Court on June 4, 1951: *Dennis et al. v. U.S.*, 341 U.S. 494.

¹³Section 14, Executive Order 10450: "(a) The Civil Service Commission, with the continuing advice and collaboration of representatives of such departments and agencies as the National Security Council may designate,

Thus, unless the laws, the Executive orders, or the regulations issued thereunder are changed by the duly constituted authorities, they form the frame of reference for a security administrator and should not be presumed, at least by him, to be illegal, unreasonable, or unjust.

In the absence of change, I conclude that the security program is adequate to:

1. Prevent Communist penetration of our Government, and
2. Protect the inherent rights of government employees.

Yet no one contends that this program is sacrosanct. In addition to the review provided in the order itself we find that the program is under constant scrutiny in the Congress, the courts, and the press.

As a result of this scrutiny and review many thoughtful persons have come to grips with the question of what a security program does to the rights of an individual American. It has been stated that civil rights are infringed, that legal rights are abated, that inherent rights are involved.

Every American, according to our tradition, is entitled to a square deal from his Government. I hope I can demonstrate, through discussion of our procedures, that the Government is endeavoring to insure this basic right.

It is difficult to argue that a security program, like other governmental programs based on law,

shall make a continuing study of the manner in which this order is being implemented by the departments and agencies of the Government for the purpose of determining: (1) Deficiencies in the department and agency security programs established under this order which are inconsistent with the interests of, or directly or indirectly weaken, the national security. (2) Tendencies in such programs to deny to individual employees fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government, or rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States or this order.

"Information affecting any department or agency developed or received during the course of such continuing study shall be furnished immediately to the head of the department or agency concerned. The Civil Service Commission shall report to the National Security Council, at least semi-annually, on the results of such study, and shall recommend means to correct any such deficiencies or tendencies.

"(b) All departments and agencies of the Government are directed to cooperate with the Civil Service Commission to facilitate the accomplishment of the responsibilities assigned to it by subsection (a) of this section."

does not in some instances and to some degree affect civil rights. It is evident, for example, that investigation of an individual can be to some extent an intrusion on that individual's privacy. Many of the rules of society translated into laws necessarily constrain individual tendencies or purposes which, except for the fact that people must live in close proximity to each other, would not be in themselves wrong.

Our laws and our courts have always taken cognizance of the matters of intent and degree. There is an obvious distinction between being jostled by an unruly passerby and being pushed to safety from in front of a speeding vehicle. The first act is at least bad manners and possibly disorderly conduct. The second is a normal human reaction which can be heroic.

Our Constitution and traditions are delicately balanced between the necessities of the basic responsibility of government to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number and, at the same time, to clearly observe and respect the sovereign rights of the individual. It is this delicate position, with its great potentials of dilemma, that requires constant scrutiny, criticism, and evaluation of our laws, procedures, and programs, including this one under discussion today. There are three questions which, among others, must be asked. First, is the danger real and present? Second, do the results justify the effort?¹⁴ Three, do the benefits exceed the disadvantages?

No thoughtful American wants to achieve absolute security in government at the cost of sacrificing our traditions or by adopting the very forms of totalitarian conduct which we seek to guard against.

We should discuss briefly the theory of a security program. It seeks to *prevent* Communist penetration of the Government. It is not designed to prosecute such penetration. It seeks to protect the public interest before and not after the commission of an overt act. Such, indeed, is one of the definitions of security.¹⁵

This theory is an important consideration in assessing this problem. If a person commits an

overt act of disloyalty he may be indicted, tried, and convicted under our judicial procedures. Under our theory of law he is innocent until proven guilty. The burden of proof rests on the Government, and the jury is instructed to resolve reasonable doubts in favor of the accused. This is a system developed through centuries to insure fair play in establishing guilt.

A security system is not intended to establish guilt, since no act against the public interest may have occurred. If such has taken place the transgressor could be prosecuted in court. The system is intended to prevent such an act. There can be no proof, since future events are not susceptible of present proof. A security risk under our procedures is not necessarily guilty of any illegal act. He is a person who has been adjudged unsuitable for Federal employment.

Department's Personnel Security Procedures

How is the judgment as to an individual's security potential reached? The security judgment must be based on some kind of data. Under Executive Order 10450 the appropriate officials are directed to make an investigation, varying in degree in accordance with the sensitivity of the position to be filled. In the State Department it was determined administratively that all positions are "sensitive". Thus, under the order, all incumbents and applicants undergo a "full field" investigation. The full field investigation means that inquiries are made in the field, at the source, as opposed to the seat of government, to substantiate all information which the individual has furnished to the Department. This begins with date and place of birth and extends through education, employment, places of residence, etc., up to the present time.

In most cases the investigation is purely routine. Everything the individual says is substantiated and no information relating to the criteria established in the order is reported. The criteria, information concerning which the investigation is designed to disclose, are: 1. behavior characteristics indicating lack of integrity or a course of conduct which leads to belief that the individual may, if subjected to coercion or pressure, be subject to hostile influence; 2. actual overt subversion; 3. establishing or continuing sympathetic association with subversives; 4. advocacy of overthrow of the Government by unconstitutional means;

¹⁴ The Atomic Energy Commission alone has spent \$100 million for personnel investigations, the Department of Defense \$29 million. (*Cong. Rec.* of June 27, 1955, p. 7878).

¹⁵ "The condition of being protected or not exposed to danger; . . .", Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition, Unabridged.

5. membership in subversive organizations; 6. engaging in espionage; 7. serving the interest of a foreign power in preference to the interest of the United States.¹⁶

If the investigator finds "derogatory information" (i. e., related to the criteria) he is instructed to attempt to ascertain the truth of the allegations he has heard.¹⁷ This is a primary safeguard against unfounded rumors, gossip, or statements from overly suspicious or unfriendly individuals.

Having, in his judgment, completed his inquiry, the investigating officer files a report with the Department's Office of Security.

Here the report is reviewed to determine whether in fact the investigators have covered all reasonable leads. If more investigation is required, it is directed from the Office of Security in the Department.

The practice is followed of permitting the employee in all cases, and the applicant according to circumstances, to furnish an oral explanation of derogatory data. This interview with the individual frequently clears up such matters as mistaken identity or leads to sources which can resolve questions which are clearly matters of opinion.

When it appears that the file is as complete as practicable it is forwarded to a separate staff in the Office of Security. This staff has as much background and training as it is possible to provide in the special field of security evaluation.

From the recitation of the criteria it is clear that the evaluator's problem is to make a calculated judgment, on the basis of what the individual has done, as to what he may reasonably be expected to do in the future when entrusted with information vital to the security of the United States and if subjected to pressures from the Communists.

The evaluating official must make a decision "to insure that the employment and retention in employment . . . is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."¹⁸ If there is reasonable doubt that the employment or retention is clearly consistent with the interests of national security, this doubt should be resolved in favor of the Government.¹⁹

¹⁶ Executive Order 10450, section 8 (a) as amended by Executive Order 10491 (18 *Fed. Reg.* 6583).

¹⁷ Investigators of the Department's Office of Security make full field investigations unless or until data relating to the national security (subversive) is reported, at which point the case is referred to the FBI.

¹⁸ Executive Order 10450, section 2.

¹⁹ Departmental Regulations, vol. I, section 392.32.

Fully 90 percent of all cases are resolved at this level by furnishing a clearance, under the standards of the order by the Office of Security, to the Office of Personnel. In those cases in which the evaluator recommends further review and possible action, the files are sent forward to the Director of the Office of Security.

If the Director of the Office of Security, after review of the file, decides that continued employment is not clearly consistent with the interests of national security, he forwards the file to the office of the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Here the matter is again reviewed by his staff and then by the Administrator personally. If he reaches the conclusion that continued employment "is not clearly consistent," he forwards the file with a recommendation for suspension to the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, to whom the Secretary of State has delegated his power to suspend.

If the decision to suspend the employee is made by the Deputy Under Secretary, he sends the file to the Department's Security Counsel, who is assigned to his office. Here a lawyer abstracts from the file all information which may be furnished the employee, and this data is the basis for the so-called "letter of charges" which must be furnished within 30 days of the notice of suspension.

The letter of charges is one of the most difficult aspects of the administration of this program. Although the employee has been given an opportunity earlier to explain orally such derogatory information as the Department may furnish him, it must be furnished again in writing.

This raises the issue of confrontation. It is a most difficult issue. Having decided that employment is not clearly consistent, it seems imprudent to furnish an individual classified information, possibly furnished by another agency, to which he is, if a security risk, surely not entitled. On the other hand, in fairness, he must be given every opportunity to explain. Like so many theoretical dilemmas it seems to resolve itself in practice. I cannot recall a single case in which the individual has been adjudged on the basis of information of which he has not the slightest inkling. In fact, one of the oddities of this business is to find the individual referring to an informant by name when the informant's identity has been protected from even the security officers.

If the employee desires to contest the Department's action he is obliged to file a written answer.

He may furnish whatever supporting data he may conclude is useful and may, of course, seek the advice of counsel of his choice.

After the employee has made an answer, the regulations provide that the Department's Administrator and the Security Counsel shall review the record and recommend either jointly or severally that the employee be reinstated in that his answer is sufficient or separated in that his answer is not sufficient.

The Deputy Under Secretary for Administration considers the recommendations. If he determines the employee's answer is not sufficient, the employee is entitled to a hearing as provided by law.²⁰

Under the regulations a hearing board, composed of a minimum of three employees of other Federal departments or agencies, is empaneled from a roster maintained by the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of practice, board members of equivalent rank and experience in Government service are obtained. Panel members may not serve if they are personally acquainted with the employee who is being processed.

Under the hearing procedure the Department's file is made available to the panel. The employee and his attorney, if he so desires, appear before the panel. The Security Counsel is present as a representative of the Secretary of State and affords legal assistance to the board.

The formal rules of evidence do not apply to this procedure. Nor does the board or the employee have subpoena power or funds to reimburse witnesses who may be forced to travel to appear. The board's function is to review the entire case in order to advise the Secretary whether or not the individual's continued employment is consistent with the interests of national security. It obviously is a further safeguard against unfair or inadequately supported decisions.

At the conclusion of the hearing the board members prepare jointly or severally a Memorandum of Reasons. Their Memorandum of Reasons together with their advice to the Secretary is then forwarded, with the file, directly to the Secretary of State. Under the law he must personally review or designate someone to personally review the case before he renders a final decision, which

²⁰ Under the provisions of P. L. 733 hearings are authorized only in the cases of employees who have a permanent or indefinite appointment and have completed their probationary or trial period.

is not subject to review outside the Department.²¹

As seems apparent from these procedures, the role of the security administrator may be likened to that of the grand jury in the judicial system. He finds, as it were, probable cause. His judgment is subject to high-level review and hearing before a final determination is made by still higher authority.

There is one further item with respect to our procedure which I should like to discuss. It has to do with publicity regarding an individual's case. It would be grossly unfair for the Department of State to point its finger at an individual and say publicly, "You, sir, are a security risk." Yet, circumstances have forced the Department to make public announcement as to the disposition of a few cases, sometimes because the employee himself publicized his case, sometimes because a third person made an issue of the matter. In no case, however, has the Department disclosed the information, obtained in confidence, which makes up its files.

The letter of suspension and all subsequent correspondence in one of these cases is marked "Limited Official Use," and it is stated in the letter that the Department regards the action as private between itself and the employee.²²

There are, of course, many facets of the personnel security program which I have not explored in the time allotted. Permit me to summarize this statement briefly.

It is apparent that the final determination, even after close adherence to the law and the procedures, is inevitably a matter of human judgment.

The best we can hope for in a security program is that legally constituted authority will:

1. Recognize the danger, now primarily the Communist conspiracy, which makes a program necessary;
2. Provide a system which will adequately defend against that danger;
3. Establish fair procedures with reasonable safeguards for the individual; and
4. Place in the position of administrative re-

²¹ These procedures are provided by Departmental Regulations published on July 27, 1953 (vol. I, sub-chapter 390).

²² The form used in the State Department letters is as follows: "This and subsequent communications will be marked *Limited Official Use* in the light of the Department's policy to regard these matters as personal between itself and the employee. The policy is intended to protect the employee and is based upon a reciprocal regard of the matter by the employee."

sponsibility those individuals who, to the best of their ability, will render sound judgments without fear or prejudice.

There is no human product which is not subject to further perfection, and it will not be argued that the security program is any exception. Improvements have been effected on the present program during its short history of two and one-half years. I am sure further ameliorations will come to pass. They will evolve from the practical knowledge and experience of those officially responsible for the carrying out of the program as well as from the independent ideas of individuals and groups especially interested, like your own. All of us are in accord with the peculiarly American system of free criticism for constructive ends. As long as we know and understand the critical danger which has required the existence of formal security procedures in this country, and while we keep ever before us the bright standard of liberty which has led us throughout our history and which makes us at once the envy of and the example to other lands, we must continue to progress.

I feel that I could not better close my talk than by repeating the most timely words of President Eisenhower to the American Bar Association at Philadelphia on August 24 this year.²³ I think his words state very lucidly the largest problem of the world today—the problem from which the necessity for security programs arises and from which widespread and deep concern for the safety and freedom of our people so justifiably stems. These excerpts from the President's speech, with which I will conclude, are very much in context.

"The central fact of today's life is the existence in the world of two great philosophies of man and of government. They are in contest for the friendship, loyalty, and support of the world's peoples.

"On the one side, our Nation is ranged with those who seek attainment of human goals through a government of laws administered by men. Those laws are rooted in moral law reflecting a religious faith that man is created in the image of God and that the energy of the free individual is the most dynamic force in human affairs.

"On the other side are those who believe—and many of them with evident sincerity—that human goals can be most surely reached by a government of men who rule by decree. Their decrees are

rooted in an ideology which ignores the faith that man is a spiritual being, which establishes the all-powerful state as the principal source of advancement and progress.

"The spirit of Geneva, if it is to provide a healthy atmosphere for the pursuit of peace, if it is to be genuine and not spurious, must inspire all to a correction of injustices, an observance of human rights, and an end to subversion organized on a worldwide scale."

Board of Foreign Scholarships

The President on September 24 appointed Mrs. Bernice B. Cronkhite to be a member of the Board of Foreign Scholarships for a term expiring September 22, 1957. On the same date he reappointed the following for terms expiring September 22, 1958: Samuel M. Brownell, Roger Allan Moore, Celestine Joseph Nuesse, and Philip H. Willkie.

Written Tests for Foreign Service To Be Held in December

Press release 569 dated September 29

The Department of State announced on September 29 that a 1-day written examination will be given in 65 cities on December 9, 1955, for candidates wishing to enter the career Foreign Service. In support of the present program to publicize the opportunities available in the Foreign Service, 25 Departmental and Foreign Service officers will shortly visit nearly 200 colleges and universities throughout the country to talk to young men and women interested in a career in the Foreign Service of the United States.

Requests to take the December examination must be filed with the Board of Examiners, Department of State, Washington, D. C., not later than October 21. Informational material and application forms may be obtained at college or university placement offices or by writing to the Department of State. Eligibility requirements for candidates are:

1. The applicant must be at least 20 and under 31 years of age.
2. Must have been a citizen of the United States for at least 10 years.

²³ BULLETIN of Sept. 5, 1955, p. 375.

3. If married, must be married to an American citizen.

Those successful in the 1-day written examination will be given a subsequent oral examination before a traveling panel which will meet in regional centers. Oral examinations will also be given in Washington. Beginning salaries for Foreign Service officers range from \$4,400 to \$5,500, depending on age and experience. Additional benefits include insurance, annual and sick leave, and a generous retirement plan.

It is expected that approximately 300 officers will be appointed during the coming year as a result of the vastly increased need for Foreign Service officers. These appointments will be made to fill positions both in the Department in Washington and at over 250 posts in 77 countries throughout the world.

Meeting of U.S.-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs

TEXT OF JOINT COMMUNIQUE¹

1. The joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs, which met in Washington in March 1954,² held its second meeting in Ottawa today.

The United States was represented by:

Hon. John Foster Dulles,
Secretary of State
Hon. George M. Humphrey,
Secretary of the Treasury
Hon. Ezra Taft Benson,
Secretary of Agriculture
Hon. Sinclair Weeks,
Secretary of Commerce

Canada was represented by:

Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe, M.P.,
Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Defence Production
Rt. Hon. J. G. Gardiner, M.P.,
Minister of Agriculture
Hon. L. B. Pearson, M.P.,
Secretary of State for External Affairs
Hon. W. E. Harris, M.P.,
Minister of Finance

¹ Issued at Ottawa on Sept. 26.

² BULLETIN of Apr. 5, 1954, p. 511.

2. In addition to the members of the Joint Committee, His Excellency Douglas Stuart, United States Ambassador to Canada, and His Excellency A. D. P. Heeney, Canadian Ambassador to the United States, participated in the discussions.

3. This Committee was established by the United States and Canadian Governments to provide an opportunity for Cabinet members of both countries concerned with economic and trade matters to meet together periodically and review developments of common interest. Its existence symbolizes the close and friendly relations existing between the two countries and is evidence of the interest which each country has in a great number and variety of economic questions affecting the other. Its meetings supplement and reinforce the daily exchanges which take place between official representatives and between private citizens of the two countries.

4. At today's meeting the exchanges of views dealt mainly with general commercial policies and prospects, with progress being achieved in dealing with broad international trade and payments problems, and with policies relating to trade in agricultural products.

5. The Committee emphasized the importance of encouraging a large and growing volume of mutually beneficial trade between the United States and Canada. They discussed the difficulties which were experienced from time to time in this connection. They shared the view that this trade would develop most satisfactorily as part of a wide-spread system of freer trade and payments. Such a multilateral pattern of trade would also best serve to sustain relations between the United States and Canada, and between each of them and the many countries with which they are associated throughout the world, on a wholesome and durable basis. The Committee recognized that policies and practices which promoted these purposes were important to the national well-being and security of the two countries.

6. The Committee noted that, with the high rates of employment and economic activity which had prevailed in most parts of the world, the level of international trade had generally been well maintained during the past year. While some progress had been made in removing restrictions and reducing discrimination in many countries, there remained, however, a need for further advances in this field.

7. It was realized that difficult, although, it is hoped, temporary problems existed as a result of the accumulation of large quantities of some agricultural products in several countries. These problems, if not handled carefully, could adversely affect the trade in such products and might also have damaging consequences for international trade generally. The members of the Committee were able to acquaint one another with their views on these matters. It was agreed that, in dealing with these problems, there should be closer consultation in an effort to avoid interference with normal commercial marketings.

8. It was recalled that the initiative for the creation of this Committee had come from conversations between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister St. Laurent in 1953,³ reflecting the keen desire which both have always shown to improve understanding and strengthen relations between the two countries. At the meeting today the Canadian members expressed their deep sympathy with President Eisenhower in his illness and their hopes that he would soon be restored to full health.

Negotiations Concluded for Sale of Agricultural Commodities to Japan

Press release 578 dated September 30

Representatives of the Government of Japan and the United States concluded negotiation of an agreement in Washington, D. C., on September 30, 1955, for the sale for yen to Japan of agricultural commodities having a total value, including certain transportation costs to be financed by the United States, of \$65,800,000. Under the agreement Japan will purchase wheat, barley, cotton, tobacco, corn, and other feedgrains. These commodities will be made available pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480, 83d Congress).

A major portion of the sales proceeds will be used by the Japanese Government on a loan basis for economic development purposes. The balance of the proceeds will be used by the United States for various purposes, including the purchase of goods in Japan for other friendly countries, edu-

cational exchange, agricultural market development, and expenditures of the U.S. forces in Japan.

The agreement was initialed on September 30 by Thorsten Kalijarvi, Acting Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and Sadao Iguchi, Ambassador of Japan. The agreement will be formally signed in Tokyo within a few weeks and will be submitted to the Japanese Diet this fall for approval.

Trade Agreement With Guatemala To Be Terminated

Press release 581 dated September 30

The U.S. Government notified the Guatemalan Government on September 28, 1955, of its acceptance of the latter's proposal of August 2, 1955, that the reciprocal trade agreement signed by both countries in 1936 be terminated by mutual consent on October 15, 1955.

This notification by the U.S. Government is the product of discussions extending over a year between representatives of both Governments regarding Guatemala's difficulty in giving full effect to the terms of the trade agreement. In making its proposal, the Guatemalan Government stated that its difficulty in applying the provisions of the trade agreement was due to the antiquated nature of its customs laws and tariffs. The Guatemalan Government also stated that it was considering the possibility of adhering to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and to this end was making a detailed study which it hoped to complete at an early date.

The action to terminate the trade agreement has been taken in a spirit of full understanding and good will between the two countries. By mutual agreement the reciprocal trade agreement will cease to have effect beginning with October 15, 1955. A proclamation terminating the proclamation of May 16, 1936, which originally put the trade agreement into force will be issued at a later date by the U.S. Government.

Termination of the trade agreement will not result in a change of duty on any product imported into the United States from Guatemala. All the items on which tariff concessions were given to Guatemala in 1936 under the trade agreement are either on the free list or, if dutiable, are now bound in other trade agreements entered into by

³ *Ibid.*, May 25, 1953, p. 752. For text of the agreement establishing the Joint Committee, see *ibid.*, Nov. 30, 1953, p. 739.

the United States. The Guatemalan Government has informed the U.S. Government that after termination of the trade agreement it intends to increase duties on only a few products covered by the trade agreement and only after thorough study by the Guatemalan Tariff Commission.

Along with the acceptance of the Guatemalan Government's proposal to terminate the trade agreement, the U.S. Government expressed the hope that the Guatemalan Government would find it possible to negotiate for accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Following are the texts of the notes exchanged between Domingo Goicolea Villacorta, Guatemalan Minister of Foreign Affairs, and U.S. Ambassador Edward J. Sparks.

Guatemala's Note to the United States

AUGUST 2, 1955

I have the honor to refer to the conversations between representatives of the Government of Guatemala and of the Government of the United States regarding termination, by mutual agreement, of the Trade Agreement of April 24, 1936.

The Government of Guatemala has clearly made known that its antiquated customs laws and tariffs and the consequent need of revising them has rendered the application of the provisions of the above-mentioned Trade Agreement increasingly difficult. In view of this situation, and in accordance with the above-mentioned conversations, I have the honor to propose to the Illustrious Government of the United States that the Trade Agreement between the Republic of Guatemala and the United States of America, signed in this city the 24th of April of 1936, cease to have effect beginning the 15th day of October of 1955.

If the Government of the United States of America agrees with the foregoing, this note and Your Excellency's answer will constitute an arrangement between our two Governments which will terminate the above-mentioned Trade Agreement, and will become effective on the date of Your Excellency's note.

The Government of Guatemala is analyzing the possibility of adhering to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and, to this end, is making a detailed study of this matter which it hopes to complete at an early date.

I take this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the testimony of my most high and distinguished consideration.

DOMINGO GOICOLEA VILLACORTA

United States Reply to Guatemala's Note

SEPTEMBER 28, 1955

I have the honor to refer to your Excellency's note dated August 2, 1955 relating to the termination by mutual consent of the trade agreement signed April 24, 1936.

I have the honor to inform you that your proposal to terminate the trade agreement by mutual consent effective October 15, 1955 is acceptable to the United States Government and that your note and this reply shall constitute an agreement between our two governments which shall enter into force today.

I am pleased to note that the Government of Guatemala is considering the possibility of adhering to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and to this end is making a detailed study which it hopes to complete at an early date. The United States Government hopes that upon completion of this study the Government of Guatemala will find it possible to undertake negotiations with a view to its accession to the General Agreement.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

EDWARD J. SPARKS

Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Four Nations

The Department of State announced on September 29 (press release 571) that, in accordance with provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and under procedures established by the Contracting Parties, negotiations for the modification of concessions previously made under the agreement have been concluded between the United States and Italy, Peru, Turkey, and the Union of South Africa, respectively.¹ The four renegotiations have resulted in no changes in U.S. duties.

When the Contracting Parties to the general agreement took action early this year to extend the firm life of the tariff concessions in the agreement from July 2, 1955, to December 31, 1957, they agreed that prior to such extension a country could renegotiate individual tariff concessions with a view to their modification or withdrawal. Procedures for renegotiations were developed at the eighth and ninth sessions of the Contracting Parties. Under article XXVIII of the agreement a country wishing to withdraw or modify a concession first must try to reach agreement with other interested countries. The usual basis for agreement is the granting of new concessions as compensation for the withdrawn concession.

Italy negotiated with the United States for the increase of the Italian concession rate on typeset-

¹ For details of the negotiations, see *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade: Analysis of Renegotiation of Certain Tariff Concessions (Italy, Peru, Union of South Africa, and Turkey)*, Department of State publication 6001, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., 15 cents.

ting and typefounding machines and parts. As compensation to the United States for this increase, Italy agreed to reduce its tariff rates on punchcard machines for accounting and statistics and on parts for these machines. In 1954, U.S. exports of the items on which the rate was reduced are estimated to have been about \$900,000, while exports of the products on which the rate was increased amounted to \$554,000.

The Peruvian negotiations were more extensive, resulting in the withdrawal of 59 concessions and the modification upward of 2 others. As compensation for these actions, Peru granted 90 new concessions to the United States and other countries. These compensatory concessions cover imports from the United States in 1954 of more than \$13 million. Imports from the U.S. of the products affected by the modifications and withdrawals were valued at about \$7.6 million in 1954.

In 1954 the Contracting Parties to the general agreement authorized Turkey to enter into negotiations with interested countries with a view to reaching agreement so that Turkey could make effective its new tariff law which, among other things, changed the basis of the tariff generally from specific to ad valorem duties. As one of the interested parties, the United States consulted with representatives of Turkey. The United States concluded that by and large the Turkish proposals were reasonable in view of the generally low level of the new tariff and since, in the process of converting from specific to ad valorem duties, the apparent increases in the bound rates on some items were largely offset by reductions on others. In the course of the consultations, Turkey agreed, at the request of the United States, to lower the ad valorem rates on certain items of particular interest to the United States.

The Union of South Africa has withdrawn general agreement concessions on 15 tariff items and increased the rate on 2 others. As compensation for the withdrawals and modifications of rates, South Africa has granted concessions on 17 items. Of these compensatory concessions, 14 involved removal or reduction of the duty, 2 involved bindings at the current duty-free rate, and 1 a binding of a ceiling rate. Only one of these compensatory concessions was made directly to the United States. The value of the U.S. trade benefited by this direct concession—on transmission chains in uncut lengths—is substantially greater than that adversely affected by the withdrawal of the three

concessions negotiated directly with the United States. In addition, U.S. trade in items on which concessions were granted directly to other countries has been considerably greater than its trade in items on which concessions were withdrawn or modified.

Corrections to Published List of Articles Imported into U.S.

Press release 568 dated September 29

Notice was given on September 29 of several corrections to the list of products to be considered in the tariff negotiations announced in Department of State publication 5993 of September 21, 1955. These are in addition to those noted in the errata list which was contained in the booklet. A notice of the changes required to correct the list has been issued. The corrections which should be made in the original list are shown below.

The original notice of the Committee for Reciprocity Information¹ also omitted reference to the possibility of filing briefs in the event the persons filing do not wish to be heard. As in the past, however, the Committee stands ready to receive such briefs, and they, like briefs of persons desiring to be heard, should be submitted not later than 12:00 noon, October 17, 1955. An amended notice to this effect has been issued.

Corrections To Be Made in the September 21 List

Par. 35: Delete the word "drugs".

Par. 217: Change the period at the end of the descriptive language to a comma and add "and if holding less than $\frac{1}{4}$ pint".

Par. 218(e) (h): After the word "filled" insert "with toilet preparations,".

Par. 230(d): Delete the language "building blocks or bricks, crystal color, and pressed and polished but undecorated".

Par. 339: Change the word "household" the second time it appears to "hospital".

Par. 706: For the word "Offal", substitute "Edible animal livers, kidneys, tongues, hearts, sweetbreads, tripe, and brains, fresh, chilled, or frozen".

Par. 1003: Delete "20-pound but not finer in size than".

Par. 1021: Insert at the end of the descriptive language "(except grass or rice straw floor coverings)".

Par. 1529(a) [27]: Delete the underscoring under the last word "Other".

Par. 1531: Insert "straps and strops;" before "wearing apparel, wholly or in chief value of reptile leather;".

¹ BULLETIN of Sept. 26, 1955, p. 510.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings ¹

Adjourned during September 1955

9th Edinburgh Film Festival	Edinburgh	Aug. 21-Sept. 11
1st U. N. Congress on Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders	Geneva	Aug. 22-Sept. 3
International Wool Textile Research Conference	Sydney (Australia)	Aug. 22-Sept. 9
16th International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art	Venice	Aug. 25-Sept. 10
International Astronomical Union: 9th General Assembly	Dublin	Aug. 29-Sept. 5
14th International Horticultural Congress	Scheveningen (Netherlands)	Aug. 29-Sept. 6
U. N. Economic Commission for Latin America: 6th Session	Bogotá	Aug. 29-Sept. 17
ICAO 2d Air Navigation Conference	Montreal	Aug. 30-Sept. 27
International Association for Hydraulic Research: 6th Congress	The Hague	Aug. 31-Sept. 6
9th International Congress of Refrigeration	Paris	Aug. 31-Sept. 8
ICAO Legal Committee: Subcommittee on Chartering and Hiring of Aircraft	The Hague	Sept. 1-6
Baltic and North Sea Radiotelephone Conference	Göteborg (Sweden)	Sept. 1-21
Damascus International Fair	Damascus	Sept. 2-30
20th Salonika International Trade Fair	Salonika	Sept. 4-25
International Commission for Criminal Police: 24th General Assembly	Istanbul	Sept. 5-9
International Scientific Tobacco Congress	Paris	Sept. 6-10
ICAO Diplomatic Conference for the Purpose of Finalizing the Protocol of Amendment of the Warsaw Convention	The Hague	Sept. 6-30
U. N. Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: Reconvened 6th Session	New York	Sept. 8-9
UNICEF Executive Board and Program Committee	New York	Sept. 8-17
International Rubber Study Group: Management Committee	London	Sept. 9 (1 day)
PASO Directing Council: 8th Meeting; and Who Regional Committee: 7th meeting	Washington	Sept. 9-21
19th Levant Fair	Bari (Italy)	Sept. 9-27
International Union of Public Transportation: 31st Congress	Naples	Sept. 11-17
U. N. Refugee Fund: 1st Meeting of Standing Program Subcommittee	Geneva	Sept. 12-16
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Monetary Fund: 10th Annual Meeting of Boards of Governors	Istanbul	Sept. 12-17
U. N. ECAFE Working Party of Experts on Hydrologic Terminology	Bangkok	Sept. 12-24
U. N. ECE Timber Committee: 13th Session	Geneva	Sept. 13-17
WHO Regional Committee for Western Pacific: 6th Session	Singapore	Sept. 13-19
GATT Working Party on Tariff Reductions	Geneva	Sept. 15-21
FAO International Chestnut Commission	Rome	Sept. 19-24
Joint FAO/WHO Conference on Food Additives	Geneva	Sept. 19-24
Pan American Highway Congress: Technical Committee on Highway Organization and Planning	Lima	Sept. 19-24
9th Pan American Congress of Architects	Caracas	Sept. 19-28
International Sugar Council: 5th Session	London	Sept. 20-21
U. N. ECE Coal Committee	Geneva	Sept. 21-22
ANZUS Council: 3d Meeting	Washington	Sept. 24 (1 day)
FAO Near East Forestry Commission: 1st Session	Teheran	Sept. 24-29

In Session as of September 30, 1955

U. N. Disarmament Commission: Subcommittee of Five	New York	Aug. 29-
Negotiation of a South Pacific Fisheries Conservation Convention	Santiago	Sept. 14-
U. N. General Assembly: 10th Session	New York	Sept. 20-
GATT Intersessional Committee	Geneva	Sept. 22-
ILO Textiles Committee: 5th Session	Geneva	Sept. 26-

¹ Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, Sept. 30, 1955. Asterisks indicate tentative dates. Following is a list of abbreviations: U.N., United Nations; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; UNICEF, United Nations Children's Fund; PASO, Pan American Sanitary Organization; WHO, World Health Organization; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; ANZUS, Australia-New Zealand-United States; ILO, International Labor Organization; ICEM, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; IRTU, International Telecommunication Union; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; Ecosoc, Economic and Social Council; NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

In Session as of September 30, 1955—Continued

U. N. ECE Conference of European Statisticians: 3d Session	Geneva	Sept. 26-
U. N. ECE Committee for the Development of Trade and East-West Trade Consultations.	Geneva	Sept. 26-
International Conference on Regional Planning and Development . .	London	Sept. 28-
Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan): Officials Meeting.	Singapore	Sept. 29-
FAO Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council: 6th Meeting	Tokyo	Sept. 30-
FAO Meeting To Consider Report on Stabilization of the International Trade in Rice.	Bangkok	Sept. 30-

Scheduled October 1–December 31, 1955

U. N. Conference on Olive Oil	Geneva	Oct. 3-
FAO Latin American Forestry Commission: 5th Session	Caracas	Oct. 4-
ICEM Executive Committee: 3d Session	Geneva	Oct. 6-
ICAO Facilitation Division: 4th Session	Manila	Oct. 10-
FAO European Forestry Commission: 8th Session	Rome	Oct. 10-
FAO European Forestry Commission: Working Party on Afforestation and Reforestation	Rome	Oct. 12-
Postal Union of the Americas and Spain: 7th Congress	Bogotá	Oct. 12-
FAO Technical Meeting on Poultry Production in Asia and the Far East	Poona (India)	Oct. 17-
Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan): Ministerial Meeting	Singapore	Oct. 17-
ILO Committee on Work on Plantations: 3d Session	Geneva	Oct. 17-
ICEM Council: 3d Session	Geneva	Oct. 17-
International Rubber Study Group: 12th Meeting	Monrovia (Liberia)	Oct. 17-
ITU International Telegraph Consultative Committee (Ccr): Study Group IX	Geneva	Oct. 17-
UNESCO Conference on the Dissemination of Science	Madrid	Oct. 19-
UNESCO International Advisory Committee on Marine Sciences and Regional Symposium on Physical Oceanography	Tokyo	Oct. 19-
FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 26th Session.	Rome	Oct. 20-
Annual World Modern Pentathlon Championships	Macolin (Switzerland)	Oct. 21-
South Pacific Commission: 14th Session	Nouméa (New Caledonia)	Oct. 22-
GATT Intersessional Committee	Geneva	Oct. 24-
International Council for the Exploration of the Sea: 43d Annual Meeting	Copenhagen	Oct. 24-
U. N. ECAFE Inland Waterway Subcommittee: 3d Session	Dacca (Pakistan)	Oct. 24-
International Wheat Council: 18th Session	Geneva	Oct. 25*-
International Wheat Conference	Geneva	Oct. 26-
ITU International Telegraph Consultative Committee (Ccr): Study Group VIII	Geneva	Oct. 26-
ICAO Pacific Regional Air Navigation Meeting	Manila	Oct. 27-
Meeting of Foreign Ministers of France, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and United States	Geneva	Oct. 27-
GATT Contracting Parties: 10th Session	Geneva	Oct. 27-
FAO Council: 22d Session	Rome	Oct. 28-
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: 3d Meeting . .	Tokyo	Oct. 31-
U. N. ECAFE Working Party on Economic Development and Planning: 1st Meeting.	Bangkok	Oct. 31-
International Exposition on "The Child in the World"	Rome	Nov. 1-
FAO Conference: 8th Session	Rome	Nov. 4-
Silver Jubilee Fair in Celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the Coronation of the Emperor.	Addis Ababa	Nov. 5-
International Wool Study Group: 6th Meeting	London	Nov. 8-
UNESCO Executive Board: 42d Meeting	Paris	Nov. 9-
U. N. ECAFE Working Party on Small-Scale Industries and Handicraft Marketing: 4th Meeting.	Bangkok	Nov. 14-
ILO Governing Body: 130th Session	Geneva	Nov. 15-
U. N. ECAFE Highway Subcommittee: 3d Session	Bangkok or Manila	Nov. 21-
1st International Congress on Documentation of Applied Chemistry .	London	Nov. 22-
2d International Fair and Exposition of Colombia	Bogotá	Nov. 25-
FAO Council: 23d Session	Rome	Nov. 26-
North Pacific Fur Seal Conference	Washington	Nov. 28-
U. N. Ecosoc Commission on International Commodity Trade: Resumed 2d Session.	Geneva	Nov. 28-
ILO Asian Technical Conference on Vocational Training for Industry.	Rangoon	Nov. 28-
1st European Civil Aviation Conference	Strasbourg	Nov. 29-
U. N. ECE Electric Power Committee	Geneva	Nov. 30-
U. N. Trusteeship Council: Special Session	New York	November
UNESCO Conference on Cultural Relations and International Cooperation.	Paris	Dec. 1-

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled October 1–December 31, 1955—Continued

UNESCO Conference of Experts on the Cultural Integration of Immigrants.	Caracas	Dec. 2–
Caribbean Commission: 21st Meeting	Aruba (Netherlands Antilles)	Dec. 5*–
FAO International Rice Commission: 5th Meeting of Working Party on Fertilizers and 6th Meeting of Working Party on Rice Breeding.	Penang (Malaya)	Dec. 5–
U.N. Seminar on Population Problems in Latin America.	Rio de Janeiro	Dec. 5–
U.N. ECAFE Railway Subcommittee: 4th Session.	New Delhi or Bombay.	Dec. 5–
U.N. ECE Steel Committee.	Geneva	Dec. 5–
ILO Inter-American Regional Technical Meeting on Cooperatives.	México, D.F.	Dec. 7–
Ciudad Trujillo International Fair.	Ciudad Trujillo	Dec. 20–
International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: Biannual Meeting of Directing Council.	Montevideo	December*
Conference of Geologists in British West Indian Territory.	Antigua (Leeward Islands)	December
NATO: Ministerial Meeting of the Council.	Paris	December*
U.N. Economic and Social Council: Resumed 20th Session.	New York	December

Danger to Future of U.N. Inherent In Discussion of Algeria

Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

Mr. President, we believe the Assembly should bear in mind certain relevant factors as it decides whether to inscribe in its agenda the item entitled "The Question of Algeria."

Remembering that a vote on the inscription of an item is without prejudice to the ultimate question of the Assembly's competence, we must nevertheless in this particular case take into account the following:

Unlike Morocco and Tunisia, which are French protectorates, Algeria under French law is administratively an integral part of the French Republic.

We have noted in the explanatory memorandum (Document A/2924) which has been submitted by the members that have proposed the item re-

specting Algeria that it is stated that "there is an imperative need for negotiations between the Government of France and the true representatives of the Algerian people" and that consideration of the Algerian question by the General Assembly would facilitate a solution by making the need for negotiation evident. We have noted further that reference is made to the right of the people of Algeria to independence as well as to the concern of the international community in a prompt solution of the Algerian problem, a concern to which the French Government is claimed to have failed to respond. Now, Mr. President, this memorandum indicates clearly that what is sought by the sponsors of the item is the sanction of the General Assembly to a course of action intended to bring about fundamental changes in the composition of one of the General Assembly's own members, that is, the French Republic. If it doesn't mean that, it doesn't mean anything.

The United States believes that the proposed item, viewed in the context of this action proposed to be sought in the General Assembly, falls within the provisions of article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter.

Let me say this final word. There is grave danger to the future of the United Nations in taking up questions whose consideration would conflict with the provisions of article 2, paragraph 7. We definitely think that this danger is inherent in the pending question. Now, of course, this Assembly can vote as it wishes, but we should be completely clear in our own minds as to just exactly what it is that we are doing.

For these reasons, the United States will vote to support the recommendation of the General Committee that this item not be included in the agenda.

¹ Made in plenary session on Sept. 30 (U.S. delegation press release 2213). At the same meeting the Assembly rejected the General Committee's recommendation against inscription of the Algerian question (BULLETIN of Oct. 3, 1955, p. 546). The vote on the recommendation was 27 (Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, U.K., U.S., Venezuela)—28 (Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukraine, U.S.S.R., Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia). There were 5 abstentions (China, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iceland, Paraguay).

Question of Inscribing Soviet Item on Relaxing International Tension

Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.¹

Mr. President, the United States will vote to inscribe the pending item on the agenda of the Tenth Session of the General Assembly.

The draft resolution submitted under this item makes reference to the recent Geneva meeting of the four Heads of Government, to the Bandung conference, and to the desirability of Governments continuing their efforts to consolidate world peace and improve international relations. These sentiments are, of course, unexceptionable. We hope they portend early progress toward the just settlement of international differences.

There are several questions which arise with respect to the draft resolution, but today I refer only to that portion of the resolution which says that the General Assembly:

... attaches particular importance to the consideration of proposals by States designed to put an end to the armaments race and to settle outstanding international problems through negotiations; to consideration of the proposals of the Soviet Government of 10 May and 21 July 1955 on the reduction of armaments, the prohibition of atomic weapons and the removal of the threat of a new war, the proposal of the United States of America on a general plan for the implementation of the disarmament proposals made by the President of the United States on 21 July 1955 at Geneva, and the proposals introduced at Geneva by the United Kingdom and by France, and of pertinent proposals by other States.

Mr. President, the United States had hoped that by this time the Soviet Union would have responded affirmatively to President Eisenhower's proposal for aerial inspection and the exchange of information on military establishments. We re-

¹ Made before the General Committee on Sept. 29 (U.S. delegation press release 2212) on the question of inscribing the Soviet resolution entitled "Measures for the Further Relaxation of International Tension and Development of International Cooperation" (U.N. doc. A/2981). The General Committee decided without objection to recommend inclusion of the item and its allocation to the First Committee.

gret that this has not yet happened because the United States continues to regard this proposal as the most promising first step toward far-reaching disarmament. This is the step we think which could lead to real progress soon. We think, accordingly, that the Soviet language in this respect is rather weak—I might say rather dilatory—as far as substance is concerned. We shall nonetheless, as I have said, vote to inscribe this item. We shall deal with the substance when the matter comes up in committee.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

General Assembly

Supplementary List of Items for the Agenda of the Tenth Regular Session of the General Assembly: Items Proposed by India. (a) Reports of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission in Korea; (b) Problem of Ex-Prisoners of the Korean War. Letter dated 21 August 1955 addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations. A/2941, August 22, 1955. 1 p. mimeo.

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories Transmitted Under Article 73e of the Charter: Report of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. Offers of Study and Training Facilities Under Resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954. Report of the Secretary-General. A/2937, August 26, 1955. 29 pp. mimeo.

Headquarters of the United Nations. Report of the Secretary-General. A/2948, August 30, 1955. 3 pp. mimeo. Request for the Inclusion of an Additional Item in the Agenda of the Tenth Regular Session: Item Proposed by India. Dissemination of Information on the Effects of Atomic Radiation and on the Effects of Experimental Explosions of Thermo-Nuclear Bombs. Letter dated 30 August 1955 addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations. A/2949, August 31, 1955. 1 p. mimeo.

Economic and Social Council

Economic Commission for Latin America. Progress Report on the Study on Social Conditions of Economic Development. E/CN.12/374, July 15, 1955. 36 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Latin America. Analysis and Prospects of Inter-Central-American Trade. E/CN.12/367, July 20, 1955. 46 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Latin America. Pulp and Paper Prospects in Latin America. E/CN.12/370, July 20, 1955. 65 pp. mimeo.

World Social Situation. Report of the Social Committee. E/2780, July 21, 1955. 13 pp. mimeo.

Economic and Social Progress by Women of the Americas

TENTH ASSEMBLY OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION OF WOMEN, MAY 29-JUNE 16

by Mrs. Frances M. Lee

The Tenth Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women, which met from May 29 to June 16, 1955, is of unusual interest because it was held at San Juan, Puerto Rico, at the invitation of the United States Government, and also because it considered major economic and educational problems facing women in this hemisphere.

The Inter-American Commission of Women is composed of delegates from each of the 21 American Republics, appointed by their respective governments. It works for the extension of women's rights and has headquarters in the Pan American Union. Its assemblies have been held in a number of Latin American capitals. The Government of Haiti had originally invited the Commission to hold its Tenth Assembly at Port-au-Prince in November 1954 but was forced to cancel plans because of damage caused by the hurricane which struck Haiti only a few weeks before the opening date.

The United States invitation for the Tenth Assembly was extended at the instance of Governor Luis Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico, and the Puerto Rican Government provided all local facilities, including the services of a secretariat. President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles sent greetings which were read at the opening session in the Legislative Palace.¹ As customary at meetings of the Commission, Mrs. Eisenhower, as the wife of the President of the host Government, was elected

honorary chairman of the assembly, and in recognition of the hospitality accorded by the Government of Puerto Rico, Mrs. Muñoz Marín was elected honorary vice chairman. Mrs. Muñoz Marín was invited to address a plenary session and expressed her profound interest, and that of the people of the Commonwealth, in the meeting and in the progress of American women.

Delegates were present from 15 of the American Republics—Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, and the United States. Official representatives came from the United Nations to explain the work of the Commission on the Status of Women, and from the International Labor Organization [ILO]. The United States delegation included two alternate delegates: Mrs. Gladys Dorris Barber, who has had wide experience in women's and civic organizations in this country and now resides at Bogotá, where her husband is Counselor of Embassy; and Mrs. Felisa Rincón de Gautier, the Mayor of San Juan, who has served in official posts in Puerto Rico for many years. The United States delegation also had the assistance of two advisers from the Puerto Rican Department of Education, Mrs. Margarita Pont Marchand and Miss Maria Socorro Lacot. Thirty-eight nongovernmental observers from the United States were accredited, representing Government agencies, the faculty of the University

• Mrs. Lee, author of the above article, is U.S. Representative on the Inter-American Commission of Women and served as U.S. delegate at its Tenth Assembly.

¹ Texts of the greetings are included in Mrs. Lee's opening address, which, together with the speech of welcome by Mrs. Rincón de Gautier, Mayor of San Juan, is annexed to this report.

of Puerto Rico, and some 20 women's organizations, including the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Girl Scouts, the National Council of Catholic Women, the Hadassah, the YWCA, the Voluntary Services of the Red Cross, the American Legion Auxiliary, and others with international affiliations.

Progress since the Ninth Assembly of the Commission in 1953 was reported by many delegates. In this period, Colombia and Honduras had achieved woman suffrage, and the women in Haiti had exercised the franchise for the first time, in local elections last January. Paraguay adopted legislation last year providing equality for women in the general field of civil rights. The number of women holding elective and appointive office in the American Republics is increasing rapidly. The chairman of the Commission, Mrs. María Concepción de Chaves of Paraguay, reported women in the parliaments of ten of the twenty-one Republics, two women as cabinet ministers, and three serving as ambassadors or ministers to foreign countries. In 1928, when the Inter-American Commission of Women was first organized, the only member country in which women had suffrage rights was the United States; at this Assembly the record showed women voting in all but two of the American Republics, usually on equal terms with men.

In accordance with a plan adopted by the Commission in 1953, the Assembly this year concentrated its attention in the social and economic field, leaving consideration of civil and political questions until its next meeting. This alternation permitted better use of documentation prepared in advance by the Commission secretariat and more thorough discussion of proposals.

Economic Matters Discussed

On the economic side, the Commission reaffirmed its support of equal pay for equal work for women, noting the standards already approved by the ILO and urging governments to implement the principle in domestic legislation. One of the resolutions adopted was based on a United States proposal and provides for informational materials which the delegates can use in their own countries in the press, in regular publications of women's organizations, and in other ways. Since the constitutions of many of the Latin American Republics incorporate the principle of equal pay for equal work, the problem is primarily one of prac-

tical implementation and enforcement of legal provisions. The United States delegation contributed a brief analysis based on experience in this country in the 16 States having equal-pay laws. The United States has stressed the necessity of equal opportunity to attain this goal.

The Commission made further plans for three projects initiated in earlier assemblies. The first of these is a study of the situation and economic responsibilities of women workers in the Americas, requested by the Ninth International Conference of American States at Bogotá in 1948. A technical survey which might be the basis for this study was completed late in 1953 and has since been reviewed by the delegates and interested international agencies. Because of the length of the report, the Commission decided further referrals to governments and official bodies should be in summary form. A full report, to be submitted to the next Inter-American Conference in 1958, will include current information. While certain statements in the survey were criticized by some of the delegates, there was general agreement that the burdens for family support carried by working women were far greater than is usually realized and that much needs to be done, particularly to prepare girls and women to earn adequately in relation to their responsibilities.

Among other measures advocated by the Commission to improve economic opportunities for women is a "continental campaign" of visits to selected countries to stimulate local action, and a conference of leaders in government agencies dealing with women workers. Since the ILO conducted a Conference on Women's Work at Lima, Peru, last December, the Commission invited its assistance in further projects.

Because of wide interest in the work of the Women's Bureau in our Department of Labor, the U.S. delegation provided an exhibit illustrating its program and many of its publications. An explanation of the exhibit, circulated in Spanish, proved highly popular.

Need for Adequate Education

The field of education attracted major interest in the Assembly because of an increasing realization that, until more women are equipped through schooling in their early years, they cannot make a full contribution to the economic or to the political life of their countries. Among the delegates were several who are currently professors or adminis-

trators in educational institutions and others who are engaged in professions requiring long preparation. Although few, if any, legal restrictions on education for women exist in the American Republics, in many areas it has not been customary for girls to remain in school long enough to obtain adequate training. The Commission had adopted recommendations on education in previous assemblies, but it had not accumulated statistics on the comparative situation of boys and girls in the various countries nor specific information which might help to promote an appreciation of educational needs. The Assembly therefore concentrated on further work in the primary and elementary field. It also urged increased budgets for education, and attention to the particular problems of vocational education and adult illiteracy.

A proposal advanced by the United States and adopted unanimously recognized that equal work opportunities for women and equal pay are objectives which require equal educational opportunities, and that such opportunities are likewise essential to equip women for their responsibilities in the family and in community life. A resolution proposed by the Haitian delegation pointed out that, in these days of rapid communication, mechanization, and industrial development, the woman who cannot read is not able to be a good worker and is also seriously handicapped in utilizing technical agriculture advice offered by the governments and other sources. It adds, "Home life requires capacity on the part of a mother to read and write." The Commission also urged the creation of local committees which might encourage parents to educate their daughters and help girls trying to continue through high school or college.

The assemblies of the Inter-American Commission of Women provide an opportunity to interest governments in the problems and capacities of women in relation to national life. However, the analysis and exchange of experience during the assemblies go far beyond the agenda of the particular meeting, for many countries lack the abundance of information we take for granted in the United States, and the personal observations of the delegates are an important part of their reports. While there are great variations among the American Republics, there are also great similarities; the deserts, the farms, and the cities of the United States offer situations as diverse and as full of human need as areas south of our border, and this is true also of every other country. The

assemblies open the way for recognition of common problems and of mutual interest in their solution.

I am greatly encouraged that so many of our women's organizations sent observers to the Assembly at San Juan, for I believe that the Inter-American Commission of Women is one of the instruments through which the people of the Americas can gain greater confidence in each other and in the constructive processes of government. The Dominican Republic has invited the Commission to hold its next Assembly at Ciudad Trujillo. This meeting will probably take place late in 1956, and I hope that organizations in this country will begin now to formulate plans to send observers, including the provision of necessary expenses. I hope also that women throughout the Americas will take full advantage of opportunities for exchange visits and study offered by governments and private sources, so that we can increase our knowledge of and acquaintance with each other.

ANNEX I—OPENING ADDRESS BY MRS. LEE

It is my privilege to welcome this Tenth Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women on behalf of the Government of the United States. It is a double privilege to welcome this Assembly to San Juan, which is at once a North American and a Latin American city. I have here a message from the President of the United States, which I shall read first in English and then in Spanish translation. The President says:

In welcoming this Tenth Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women to the United States, I feel great satisfaction that our common purpose can be further strengthened by the cooperation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Here, the rich cultures of the Americas are joined in mutual understanding.

Since this Commission was first organized, in 1928, the capacity of women for public service and leadership has been increasingly recognized. Today, American women are Members of Congresses and Cabinets; they are Delegates to our great International Conferences, and they are serving with great ability as Ambassadors of Governments. This progress is a tribute to the influence of the Inter-American Commission of Women.

I have also a message from the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. He says:

I am asking Mrs. Lee to bring you my personal greeting at the opening of the Tenth Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women in San Juan, where you are meeting on an invitation extended by the United States

Government at the cordial instance of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I am sure that the United States, along with all other Members of the Commission, will continue to gain by its work on behalf of the women of America. Will you please express to each of the Delegates my confidence in the success of the Assembly.

We are all aware, I am sure, of the preparations made by the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for this meeting. The women of Puerto Rico have participated in previous meetings of our Commission in various ways. The experience of the Government of Puerto Rico has often had direct bearing on our work because the legal system in this area goes back to the same Spanish colonists who settled in Central and South America.

Women throughout the United States have been proud of the record women have made here in Puerto Rico through their organizations and in public office. As you know, San Juan has had a lady mayor for the past 9 years, and other cities here in Puerto Rico have also elected women mayors. The first woman was elected to the Puerto Rican legislature more than 20 years ago, in 1932. This was in advance of many legislatures in the continental United States and helped set a standard for them. The present vice president of the Puerto Rican House of Representatives is a woman who, besides long and distinguished service in that body, has been successful also as a coffee grower and a teacher.

I do not need to tell you, perhaps, that this early recognition of women in Puerto Rico stems from an old tradition, the same Hispanic tradition that holds a woman's name equal with that of her husband in marriage. After all, it was from this island of Puerto Rico that some of the first Caribbean leadership for women came, in the fields of education and the arts as well as in the long and ultimately successful campaign for full political recognition of women citizens here. It is interesting to recall that Puerto Rican men have been actively interested in this progress as well as Puerto Rican women. In this connection we need only remember the honored name of Eugenio Maria de Hostos, who helped establish the splendid school system of the Republic of Chile and was largely responsible for the admission of women to the National University of that country—a privilege granted in Chile sooner than in any other country of the hemisphere.

Most of the laws which actually determine the

status of women in the United States are within the jurisdiction of our local governments, so that the work of this Commission has its effect in the United States chiefly when it is taken into account by local governing bodies. Education, marriage, guardianship, for example, are considered local matters to be determined within the States. From a practical point of view, there is great merit, therefore, in our meeting here in San Juan where local leaders can become familiar with our work.

We are meeting in the Western Hemisphere, the largest area in the world in which people have the right to determine their countries' development under a system of cooperation which has been an example to the world in its functioning and accomplishment. In this hemisphere governments and peoples gather without fear of each other. Nowhere else is there so great a hope. We can no longer limit our task to the elimination of specific discrimination against women and of legal barriers to their education and employment. These discriminations and barriers have to a great extent disappeared, due in considerable degree to the work of this Commission, which for 27 years has been active in seeking equality for women.

Now that both civil and political rights have been given to women in practically all of the American Republics, we are entering on the much wider and perhaps more difficult task of making full use of these rights. Pointing out opportunities to governments through which women may develop their talents and contribute fully to the life of the family, the community, and the nation is a basic responsibility of this Commission. Today, doors are open to women, but it will depend largely on our generation whether these opportunities are used to the greatest advantage.

It is true that women who have had the chance to learn and to understand their new responsibilities have confidence in their ability and can change the patterns of whole areas by working together. We must be sure that all the women in our countries are equipped by education to help their families and their communities.

The delegates to the Inter-American Commission of Women are charged with a great responsibility to advance the purpose of the Commission to bring about a real change in the lives of millions of women in the countries they represent and to insure the strength and continuity of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

In closing, let me say again that it is a great

privilege to welcome you on behalf of the Government of the United States. Let us, as delegates of our countries, build firm the foundation on which women will stand in the service of their countries and of the world.

ANNEX II—ADDRESS BY MRS. RINCÓN DE GAUTIER

[Translation]

I am devoutly grateful for the realization today of a dream which I have cherished for many years: that of seeing in my own homeland a meeting such as we have here of representatives of the most distinguished women's organizations of the entire American world. It is with the greatest pleasure that I welcome you to the capital of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The city which rejoices to welcome you today is one of the oldest in the history of America, and also one of the most modern in spirit and social development. Puerto Rico is proud of its past history, its traditions, its music, dances, and language. Puerto Rico, while profoundly aware of its Spanish American roots, welcomes the progressive spirit of the people of the United States with whom the Puerto Rican people have established an exemplary and fraternal political association. Here in San Juan, my friends, there are no strangers. We all feel the basic unity of the hemisphere and recognize the magnificent opportunities afforded by the creative co-existence of the great cultures of the New World.

As a Puerto Rican woman, I am all the happier today to be able to state proudly that in this land women have achieved their rights and have done a magnificent job, without sacrificing their traditions, their devotion to their homes, nor their femininity. Wherever you may go in this Island, you will find capable women holding responsible positions in both public life and private enterprise, helping to build a better Puerto Rico. In that respect, I am bound to make public acknowledgment of the extreme generosity toward women and their aspirations on the part of Puerto Rican men, who not only have never opposed our aspirations to public service but indeed have helped us in that direction, treating us always as equals yet respecting us as women. In every aspect of our public life there is today ample opportunity for women. Everywhere women are needed and everywhere are accepted as an indispensable ele-

ment in the day's work: in schools, factories, and hospitals; in the professions; in commerce; in law and in political fields.

I believe that all this has been possible in Puerto Rico because of the devotion which the people of the Commonwealth feel for the democratic way of life. The tolerance of Puerto Ricans with regard to the free expression of ideas, their faith in the will of the people as expressed fully and without coercion at the polls, the absence of racial prejudice and caste economy; all these have been made possible in great measure, I believe, by the increasing participation by women in every field of our social progress.

Puerto Rican women do not feel that it is enough to render service to the people of Puerto Rico only. We wish to serve all the peoples of America in ever increasing degree. In behalf of our people, modest in temporal resources but generously endowed by Heaven with strength, and most especially in behalf of the women of Puerto Rico, I extend our most cordial greetings, desiring for each and every one of you the happiest and most fruitful visit possible to this capital city whose Government at this time I represent; and I pray for guidance so that in our deliberations we may be able to serve all peoples of the world.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

ICAO Facilitation Division

The Department of State announced on September 28 (press release 567) that Thomas B. Wilson, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, will head the U.S. delegation to the fourth session of the Facilitation Division of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), which is scheduled to be held at Manila, October 10-25, 1955. Mr. Wilson will be assisted by Harry G. Tarrington, Planning Officer, Office of Assistant Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, who will serve as delegate and vice chairman, and by the following advisers:

Ellis K. Allison, Aviation Division, Department of State
Horace S. Dean, Assistant Chief, Plant Quarantine Branch, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture

Robert L. Froman, Assistant Director, Bureau of Safety Regulation, Civil Aeronautics Board

Paul Reiber, Assistant to General Counsel, Air Transport Association

Knud Stowman, M. D., International Health Representative, Division of Foreign Quarantine, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Robert L. Suddath, Chief Special Projects Officer, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice

Edward F. Thompson, Air Coordinator, Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury

Orion J. Libert, Office of International Conferences, Department of State, will serve as secretary of the delegation.

Under the Chicago Convention of December 7, 1944, the International Civil Aviation Organization is charged with the responsibility of adopting and amending standards and recommended practices dealing with entry and clearance requirements and procedures. At the Chicago meeting, contracting states agreed to adopt special regulations and practices to facilitate the movement of aircraft, crews, passengers, and cargo, especially in the administration of laws relating to immigration, customs, public health, and agricultural quarantine. To this end, on November 23, 1945, a Division on Facilitation of International Air Transport was set up under the Air Transport Committee of the Provisional Civil Aviation Organization (PICAQ) in order to develop a set of standards and recommended practices on facilitation of international air transport.

The fourth session will review the activities of the organization in the field of facilitation since the third session of the Facilitation Division held at Buenos Aires, November 21–December 7, 1951. Consideration will be given to proposals relating to documentation requirements for entry and departure of aircraft, persons, and air cargo; techniques and procedures for handling increased air traffic resulting from nonconventional (helicopter) and jet operations; and the question of improving sanitation, public health, and agricultural quarantine requirements.

THE DEPARTMENT

Recess Appointments

Robert S. Folsom, Deputy Director of the Office of Regional American Affairs, to be Alternate U.S. Representative on the Council of the Organization of American States, September 24.

October 10, 1955

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Agriculture

International plant protection convention. Done at Rome December 6, 1951. Entered into force April 3, 1952.¹
Ratification deposited: Italy, August 3, 1955.

Death, Causes of

World Health Organization Regulations No. 1 regarding nomenclature with respect to diseases and causes of death. Done at Geneva July 24, 1948. Entered into force January 1, 1950.

Notification by the Netherlands of extension to: Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, October 14, 1954.

Labor

Convention (No. 53) concerning the minimum requirement of professional capacity for Masters and Officers on board merchant ships. Done at Geneva October 24, 1936. Entered into force March 29, 1939. 54 Stat. 1683.
Notification by France of application to: Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana, and Réunion, April 27, 1955.

Convention (No. 54) concerning annual holidays with pay for seamen. Done at Geneva October 24, 1936.²
Notification by France of application to: Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana, and Réunion, April 27, 1955.

Convention (No. 55) concerning shipowners' liability in case of sickness, injury, or death of seamen. Done at Geneva October 24, 1936. Entered into force October 29, 1939. 54 Stat. 1693.
Notification by France of application to: Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana, and Réunion, April 27, 1955.

Convention (No. 58) fixing the minimum age for the admission of children to employment at sea. Done at Geneva October 24, 1936. Entered into force April 11, 1939. 54 Stat. 1705.
Notification by France of application to: Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana, and Réunion, April 27, 1955.

Ratification deposited: Denmark, June 4, 1955.

Convention (No. 73) concerning the medical examination of seafarers. Done at Seattle June 29, 1946.

Notification by France of application to: Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana, and Réunion, April 27, 1955.

Entered into force: August 17, 1955.¹

Convention (No. 74) concerning the certification of able seamen. Done at Seattle June 29, 1946. Entered into force July 14, 1951. TIAS 2949.

Notification by France of application to: Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana, and Réunion, April 27, 1955.

Organization of American States

Charter of the Organization of American States. Signed at Bogotá April 30, 1948. Entered into force December 13, 1951. TIAS 2361.

Ratification deposited: Uruguay, September 1, 1955.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

² Not in force.

Slave Trade

Protocol amending slavery convention signed at Geneva September 25, 1926 (46 Stat. 2183), and annex. Done at New York December 7, 1953. Protocol entered into force December 7, 1953;¹ annex entered into force July 7, 1955.²

Acceptance deposited: Israel, September 12, 1955.

War, Prevention of

American treaty on pacific settlement (Pact of Bogotá). Signed at Bogotá April 30, 1948. Entered into force May 6, 1949.¹

Ratification deposited: Uruguay, September 1, 1955.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

BILATERAL

Australia

Agreement concerning reciprocal changes in immigration regulations relating to nonimmigrant visas. Effected by exchanges of notes at Canberra July 29, August 9, 17, and 20, 1955. Entered into force August 20, 1955; operative September 1, 1955.

China

Agreement amending section B of the annex to the air transport agreement of 1946, as amended (TIAS 1609, 2184), by providing an additional route from China to Okinawa and points beyond. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington February 7 and April 15, 1955. Entered into force April 15, 1955.

Cuba

Agreement providing for performance by members of Army, Navy, and Air Force Missions of duties of Military Assistance Advisory Group specified in article V of military assistance agreement of March 7, 1952 (TIAS 2467). Effected by exchange of notes at Habana June 24 and August 3, 1955. Entered into force August 10, 1955.

Thailand

Agreement for the sale and purchase of tin concentrates. Signed at Bangkok September 9, 1955. Entered into force September 9, 1955.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Air Transport Services. TIAS 3022. Pub. 5608. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Spain—amending agreement of December 2, 1944, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington July 21, 1954. Entered into force July 21, 1954.

¹ Not in force for the United States.

Technical Cooperation, Special Technical Services. TIAS 3023. Pub. 5617. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Ethiopia. Exchange of notes—Signed at Addis Ababa April 21, 1954. Entered into force April 21, 1954.

Technical Cooperation, Water Resources Development Program. TIAS 3025. Pub. 5619. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Ethiopia. Exchange of notes—Dated at Addis Ababa April 27 and May 11, 1954. Entered into force May 11, 1954.

United States Educational Foundation in Greece. TIAS 3037. Pub. 5645. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Greece—amending agreement of April 23, 1948. Exchange of notes—Signed at Athens June 28, 1954. Entered into force June 28, 1954.

Technical Cooperation, Housing Program. TIAS 3041. Pub. 5649. 20 pp. 15¢.

Agreement between the United States and Chile—Signed at Santiago June 28, 1954. Entered into force June 28, 1954.

Mexican Agricultural Workers. TIAS 3043. Pub. 5654. 8 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Mexico—amending agreement of August 11, 1951, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at México July 16, 1954. Entered into force July 16, 1954.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: September 26-October 2

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press release issued prior to September 26 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 564 of September 23.

No.	Date	Subject
567	9/28	Delegation to ICAO meeting
568	9/29	Corrections to tariff negotiations list
569	9/29	Foreign Service examinations
*570	9/29	Ambassador Thayer sworn in
571	9/29	Renegotiations under GATT
572	9/29	Hoover's departure for Far East
573	9/29	Foreign Ministers' statement on Germany
574	9/29	Foreign Ministers' communique
575	9/29	Dulles: President's illness
576	9/30	Change in Colombo Plan delegation
*577	9/30	Holland: U.S. foreign policy in Latin America
578	9/30	Sale of agricultural commodities to Japan
579	9/30	Dulles-Von Brentano discussions
580	9/30	Revised itinerary for Hoover-Hollister trip
581	9/30	Termination of trade agreement with Guatemala

*Not printed.

October 10, 1955

Index

Vol. XXXIII, No. 850

Agriculture. Negotiations Concluded for Sale of Agricultural Commodities to Japan	577
Algeria. Danger to Future of U.N. Inherent in Discussion of Algeria (Lodge)	582
American Republics. Economic and Social Progress by Women of the Americas (Lee)	584
Argentina. Recognition of New Government of Argentina	560
Asia. Mr. Hoover and Mr. Hollister Leave for Far East	566
Atomic Energy. International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (Strauss)	555
Canada. Meeting of U.S.-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs (text of communique)	576
Economic Affairs	
Corrections to Published List of Articles Imported into U.S.	579
Meeting of U.S.-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs (text of communique)	576
Negotiations Concluded for Sale of Agricultural Commodities to Japan	577
Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Four Nations	578
Trade Agreement With Guatemala To Be Terminated (texts of notes)	577
Educational Exchange. Board of Foreign Scholarships	575
Foreign Service. Written Tests for Foreign Service To Be Held in December	575
France	
Danger to Future of U.N. Inherent in Discussion of Algeria (Lodge)	582
Foreign Ministers Discuss Coming Geneva Conference	559
U.S.-U.K.-French Views on Germany	559
Germany	
Foreign Ministers Discuss Coming Geneva Conference	559
Talks Between Secretary Dulles and German Foreign Minister	560
U.S.-U.K.-French Views on Germany	559
Greece. U.S. Friendship for Greece (Eisenhower)	560
Guatemala. Trade Agreement With Guatemala To Be Terminated (texts of notes)	577
International Organizations and Meetings	
Calendar of Meetings	580
Change in U.S. Delegation to Colombo Plan meeting	567
Economic and Social Progress by Women of the Americas (Lee)	584
U.S. Delegation to ICAO Facilitation Division Session	588
International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (Strauss)	555
Italy. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Four Nations	578
Japan. Negotiations Concluded for Sale of Agricultural Commodities to Japan	577

Military Affairs. Policy on Supplying Arms to Countries of Middle East (joint statement)	560
Near East. Policy on Supplying Arms to Countries of Middle East (joint statement)	560
Peru. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Four Nations	578
Presidential Documents. U.S. Friendship for Greece	560
Publications	
Current U.N. Documents	583
Recent Releases	590
Refugees and Displaced Persons. U.S. Program for Refugee Relief (Morton)	561
State, Department of	
American Political Democracy and the Problem of Personal Security (McLeod)	568
Board of Foreign Scholarships	575
Recess Appointments (Folsom)	589
Written Tests for Foreign Service To Be Held in December	575
Treaty Information. Current Actions	589
Turkey. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Four Nations	578
Union of South Africa. Renegotiation of Tariff Concessions With Four Nations	578
U.S.S.R.	
Foreign Ministers Discuss Coming Geneva Conference	559
Question of Inscribing Soviet Item on Relaxing International Tension	583
United Kingdom	
Foreign Ministers Discuss Coming Geneva Conference	559
Policy on Supplying Arms to Countries of Middle East (joint statement)	560
U.S.-U.K.-French Views on Germany	559
United Nations	
Current U.N. Documents	583
Danger to Future of U.N. Inherent in Discussion of Algeria (Lodge)	582
Question of Inscribing Soviet Item on Relaxing International Tension (Lodge)	583
Yugoslavia. U.S.-Yugoslav Talks Concluded (joint communique)	566

Name Index

Brownell, Samuel M.	575
Cronkhite, Bernice B.	575
Dulles, Secretary	566
Eisenhower, President	560, 566
Folsom, Robert S.	589
Giocola, Villacorta, Domingo	578
Hollister, John B.	566
Hoover, Herbert, Jr.	566
Lee, Frances M.	584
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr.	582, 583
McLeod, R. W. Scott	568
Moore, Roger Allan	575
Morton, Thruston B.	561
Nuesse, Celestine Joseph	575
Prochnow, Herbert V.	566
Rincón de Gautier, Felisa	588
Sparks, Edward J.	578
Strauss, Lewis L.	555
Willkie, Philip H.	575

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Recent releases in the popular Background series . . .

The Union of Burma

This 16-page illustrated pamphlet describes the land and the people of Burma. Touching briefly on the past, this Background also describes the government and the Pyidiwatha program of the new Burma. Concerning the position of Burma in world affairs, the pamphlet states that . . . "the people of Burma have long preferred to be left alone to develop their own resources. Today Burma's leaders realize the impossibility of such a position. As they view it the country is being forced into greater involvement in world affairs, and they are seeking ways in which Burma can strengthen the ties with its neighbors and make its leadership felt regionally."

Publication 5913

10 cents

Jordan

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in Western Asia is one of the nine sovereign Arab States with which the United States has direct relations. Geographically it occupies a central position in that vast area from the Mediterranean to the Arabian Sea known as the Middle East—the security of which is important to the interests of the free world and the United States. West of the Jordan River, the Kingdom encompasses a significant portion of the Holy Land. Here in this Background is a brief survey of this land with its rich traditions which has for centuries provided an important link in the trade between the East and the West.

Publication 5907

10 cents

Southeast Asia: Critical Area in a Divided World

Although it sprawls across a vast area more than 3,000 miles from east to west and more than 2,000 from north to south, Southeast Asia has less than half the actual land mass of the United States. Its population is about 10 million greater. The land form is varied, the population more so; and the configuration of the land has created barriers not only between countries but also between communities. This illustrated pamphlet discusses briefly the individual countries of this region—Burma, Thailand, Viet-Nam, Laos, Cambodia, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines—and the beginnings of a pattern of collective security for the entire Pacific area.

Publication 5841

15 cents

These Background pamphlets may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Please send me
copies

- ☐ *The Union of Burma*
☐ *Jordan*
☐ *Southeast Asia: Critical Area in a Divided World*

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____



the
Department
of
State

Order Form

to: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or
money order).

AVOID
D